

JUL 2 1947

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

RECEIVED FROM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

Industrial Relations and Education

Phillips Bradley, *Issue Editor*

Editorial, 449; *PUBLIC EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS*—The Place of Industrial Relations in the Social Studies, *Hilda M. Watters*, 453; Industrial Relations in Vocational Education, *Clarence L. Greiber*, 456; Industrial Relations in Adult Education, *Leland P. Bradford*, 460; *HIGHER EDUCATION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS*—Higher Education and Labor Relations, *Donald J. Shank*, 465; Graduate Training in Labor Relations, *John T. Dunlop*, 469; The University's Contribution to Advanced Labor Education, *John T. Dunlop and James J. Healy*, 472; Higher Education and Research in Industrial Relations, *Helen Baker*, 477; *UNIVERSITY EXTENSION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS*—Areas and Services of University Extension in Industrial-Relations Programs, *Baldwin M. Woods and Abbott Kaplan*, 484; University Extension and Industrial Relations in Wisconsin, *Lorentz H. Adolfsen*, 489; *UNION VIEWS OF EDUCATIONAL SERVICES*—Unions Look at Education in Industrial Relations, *Kermit Eby and Frank Fernbach*, 494; Unions Look at Education in Industrial Relations, *Mark Starr*, 499; *MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD INDUSTRIAL-RELATIONS TRAINING*—Management Looks at Education in Industrial Relations, *Leonard J. Fletcher*, 503; Management Looks at Education in Industrial Relations, *Glenn Gardiner*, 506; *EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND PROJECTS IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS*—Catholic-Sponsored Labor-Management Education, *Leo Cyril Brown*, 510; Management Training Programs and Agencies, *Joseph H. Vertrees*, 513; Agencies and Programs in Workers' Education, *Eleanor G. Coit and John D. Connors*, 520

APRIL 1947

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

PUBLISHED BY

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

32 WASHINGTON PLACE, NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

Editorial Staff

E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor-in-Chief*

JOHN C. PAYNE, *Asst. Managing Editor*

DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Editor*

JEAN B. BARR, *Business Manager*

HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, RHEA K. BOARDMAN, FREDERIC M. THRASHER, HERMAN A.

ERNST, STEPHEN G. RICH, I. DAVID SATLOW, STEPHEN J. WRIGHT, *Associate Editors*

Permanent Departments

Significant Developments in Education, E. GEORGE PAYNE, *Editor*

Book Reviews, HARVEY W. ZORBAUGH, *Editor*

THE PAYNE EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY FOUNDATION, INCORPORATED

Board of Trustees

E. GEORGE PAYNE, *President*

MARTIN G. HALPRIN

HERMAN A. ERNST, *Vice-President*

HERBERT D. HARPER

HENRY MEISSNER, *Secretary*

STEPHEN G. RICH

TORD E. HOLMBERG, *Treasurer*

I. DAVID SATLOW

DAN W. DODSON, *Managing Trustee*

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is published by The Payne Educational Sociology Foundation, Inc., monthly from September to May, inclusive. Publication and business office, Room 51, 32 Washington Place, New York 3, N. Y. Editorial office, Room 41, 32 Washington Place, New York 3, N. Y. The subscription price is \$3.00 per year; foreign rates, Canadian and South American, \$3.25; all others, \$3.40; the price of single copies is 35 cents each. Orders for less than half a year will be charged at the single-copy rate.

Entered as second-class matter September 27, 1934, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY is indexed in *Educational Index*, *Public Affairs Information Service*, and *Business Education Index*.

The publishers of THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY are not responsible for the views held by its contributors.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY

A Magazine of Theory and Practice

Vol. 20

April 1947

No. 8

EDITORIAL

The improvement of labor-management relations is the most urgent domestic concern of our time. On creating a more co-operative approach toward such problems as increasing productivity, maintaining high employment, organizing more effective distribution depends upon economic and social security for all.

It is a truism to say that we have already created the technological conditions for that security—at a level substantially higher than exists today. The most evident and critical area of lag lies in the conduct of human relations within the industrial discipline. Here, our achievements in understanding and in practice fall far behind our technical advances. In the present context of labor-management relations, it is not, perhaps, an exaggeration to say that the problems of morale will be more decisive for the future of our economy and our American democracy than the problems of technique.

Many forces and institutions within our economy, as well as outside it, influence the character and conduct of labor-management relations. Some exert a more immediate impact on these relations because they are integral elements of the going economic system

as, for instance, industrial managements and labor unions. Others affect these relations less directly as, for example, other organized groups (e.g., farm and civic agencies) and the responses of unorganized citizens (through the intangible but ultimately pervasive tides of public opinion). Among these forces, education can play an important role—through promoting a more co-operative approach to a more stable economy.

In devoting an issue of *THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY* to several current developments in this significant field, the editors have focused attention on the educational potential in improving industrial relations. The articles brought together here may suggest the wide range and scope of present educational ideas, projects, and services. They may also emphasize the unusual opportunities for integrating the policies and programs of our schools and universities with those of labor and management organizations in a concerted approach to this primary domestic issue.

A glance at the table of contents will indicate that education in industrial relations is rapidly expanding. From the high school to the graduate school and adult-education services, public and private educational institutions are offering many types of educational programs and services. In many unions and in industrial concerns, training in specific aspects of internal policy and practice or in general economic and social questions is conducted for various groups within these organizations. Space limits preclude an inclusive catalogue of the educational programs, projects, and services in industrial relations available today or all the variants of opinion in regard to their objectives. The portrayal does, however, provide a valuable survey of the types of education in the field.

A major part of that value lies in the varying attitudes expressed by a number of the authors toward the contributions of our educational institutions both to general civic and to specific professional training in industrial relations. It is unnecessary to comment

on the question in detail. If, however, our schools and colleges are to function effectively as promoters of better understanding—and so greater co-operation—between labor and management, they must take account of the criticisms of their programs by both industry and labor. Some humility on both sides may well be called for if education is to render an effective service in an area of controversy, and often of open conflict, on public policy.

It may be pointed out also that what education can do to mitigate the struggle of competing interests is not unlimited; it is not the only tool available and sometimes may not prove the most useful. Its integrities must be recognized by the parties no less than their concerns must be adequately appreciated by the educator. Since he is detached from immediate partisanship by his vocation, he runs the risk of either indifference or isolation. Neither quality is an essential ingredient of detachment, however they may sometimes be used as pretexts for educational inaction. The “pricking out” of the line is not easy for the educator or his labor/management clienteles; it will be achieved only with experimentation and mutual toleration.

Here, then, is a broad survey of training, research, and extension in industrial relations—in and out of school. One *caveat* should be explicitly stated. Those authors who were asked to write about particular projects were expressly exempted from attempting an elaborate or all-inclusive listing or appraisal. The mention, therefore, of specific examples by any author does not imply that there are not other—and equally good—examples of programs, projects, and services. Comparison or evaluation was not intended and was not, indeed, attempted because (if for no other reason) space limitations made completeness impracticable.

My task as editor of this issue of *THE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL SOCIOLOGY* has been a most pleasant one. It has been largely one of trying to bring together a representative team of those with practical experience—and a point of view. The readers of these pages

will find vigorous opinions, not always unanimous, on the objectives and techniques of education in industrial relations. The words throughout are those of the authors. Beyond certain omissions because of space requirements, no changes have been made. To all of those who have contributed so generously to this symposium, I, no less than their other readers, are deeply indebted.

PHILLIPS BRADLEY

Phillips Bradley is Director of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations at the University of Illinois.

THE PLACE OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Hilda M. Watters

"Above all others must the children of a republic be fitted for society as well as for themselves." This statement made by Horace Mann gives an excellent summary of the purposes of our educational system. To prepare citizens to take their places as leaders and workers in the society in which they live is, then, our main objective. But this society changes and new problems present themselves with alarming rapidity; the teacher must, therefore, also change her subject matter and methods as new issues come into the limelight.

The problem of industrial relations is not new. It has become the most vital of the problems which involve the domestic security and general welfare of the nation. As our social life becomes more complex, each individual is more directly affected by the kinds of industrial and labor relations that exist.

Courses in the social studies are probably the most logical places for subject matter in this field, though in the past the topic has been discussed in a general way in classes in the history of the United States and in problems of democracy courses. Only within the last three or four years, when the problem of industrial relations became so acute in our domestic affairs, have educators become concerned with the fact that the question deserves careful and adequate treatment in the classroom. A few articles have appeared in professional magazines urging that the schools give more attention to subject matter in industrial relations. Whereas a few years ago there was no material on the subject written specifically for classroom use, a limited number have now appeared. Moreover, a number of states and cities have recently included the subject in their revised social-studies curricula. These are encouraging signs, for they indicate

that we are becoming more aware of the needs of our future citizens in society.

Specifically, then, what can the social-studies class do with the subject of industrial relations, and what are the best ways to treat the problem? In the first place, the course in United States history offers an excellent opportunity to teach the development of the problem all through our history and to show the effects of the progress of big business and organized labor on our society. May it be said at this point that too few teachers of history do anything but teach chronology. In so doing, they lose the opportunity of teaching the pupil to assemble facts pertaining to a particular topic so that he has a fairly comprehensive understanding of that topic. Most history textbooks are written chronologically, which is desirable; but the teacher should then use the class period to help the pupil organize subject matter topically. Thus the pupil will have a two-way approach to the problem, which will help him to better associate facts.

Secondly, the problems of democracy course should devote considerable time, possibly one third of the course, to the topic of industrial relations. No other real-life situation will touch the student in as many ways after he leaves the classroom. As an active member of society he will very likely be engaged in some sort of business as a wage earner, a salaried employee, or an owner. Whether he is a worker or an employer, or even if he is merely a consumer-citizen of our society, he must know something of the relationships between management and labor.

In the third place, the social-studies course can utilize all available current materials on the subject. Most social-studies teachers include in their programs some study of current events. A great opportunity awaits the teacher who will use current subject matter pertaining to labor-management relations. Many teachers avoid the topic because it is of a controversial nature or because it is difficult and requires added preparation on the part of the teacher as well as the pupil. A careful analysis of problems will help to form an enlightened

public opinion. The very fact that the subject is controversial will cause the pupils to be more interested. No attempt should be made to indoctrinate the members of the class for or against either labor or management. All sides of an issue should be carefully studied and if conclusions are drawn let them be drawn by the pupils. The object is not to get a class to solve a problem, but rather to understand all aspects of it.

Take for example the question of portal-to-portal pay for workers and examine all phases of the problem. The class might well formulate its own questions about the issue: Why has the problem presented itself? What are the arguments for and against it? What is the present status of the issue in labor-management relations? If the student explores all the facts, he may then draw his own conclusions on that particular question. But more important than any conclusion he may draw is the fact that he has become a better informed citizen of society.

Granted that a better citizenry will result from the teaching of industrial relations and that the social-studies classroom is one of the logical places to present such material, we still have to recognize the problem it presents to the teacher. What can the social-studies teacher do to be better equipped to teach industrial relations? A list of suggestions may suffice: (1) Adequately inform herself on the background of the subject by studying a few well-selected works dealing with the problem. (2) Make a careful study of all points of view of current issues so that she can discuss them fairly and impartially with the class. (3) Procure all available material such as prepared courses of study, units of work, projects, and visual materials, which have some treatment of labor and industrial relations. With these as a guide, she should prepare her own outline for teaching the subject matter. (4) Learn something about labor-management relations from firsthand observation. Most teachers are totally unaware of the actual workings of a labor union or of the attitudes of the employer except as they have been presented in textbooks. A special course or research work which would offer an

opportunity to see the wheels of this great dynamo in operation would be of inestimable value to the teacher. Surely no other field could present a greater variety of situations to be observed. She should endeavor to discuss these questions with both employers and employees in several different kinds of occupation, and to observe the labor union as it deals with individual members and with management. It is important that the teacher always keep in mind the value to her and her pupils of getting as accurate a picture as possible. Actual observations are often propagandizing in themselves, for the observer may see only the minute part that the particular group wants to have portrayed.

Because of the opportunities in social-studies courses, it is the opinion of the writer that on the teachers in this field rests the burden of better training our young people to understand problems arising between management and labor. Unless the teachers assume the responsibility of procuring accurate information and of presenting it in carefully organized plans for class study, one of the most vital civic problems of today will remain unsolved. Domestic wars, like international wars, are born in the minds of men; with understanding of the issues involved, the problems that bring about those wars may be solved. It is a real challenge to the social-studies teachers of our nation. Teachers! Awake to the challenge!

Hilda M. Watters is Associate Professor in the Department of Social Sciences, Western Illinois State Teachers College, Macomb, Illinois.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Clarence L. Greiber

Industrial management recognizes that the human structure of plant organization is the essential factor in efficient production, and that the human element so necessary for production must be cultivated in a scientific and systematic manner. The training of

workers in knowledge and skill must be considered, but the cultivation of satisfactory human relations is of such paramount importance that everyone in an administrative or supervisory position must be a trained individual, and that his training must be continued periodically in this area throughout his entire working life.

It is a responsibility of vocational education to emphasize in industrial-relations training that such trite expressions as "experience is the best teacher" and "learn by doing" must not be taken too literally. One becomes expert through practice, but skills and information must be taught in the initial stages; and until such teaching is done and standards are established, the learner is not ready to begin his practice on the job. By the same token one cannot learn by doing when he does not know how to begin and what to do.

The position of vocational education in this training shows that the public pays to train individuals, not directly to benefit the employer, nor to benefit the employee as such, but to cultivate the talents of all individuals engaged in production and supervision. This is the purpose of vocational education, to the end that the general public will enjoy the results of efficient production and distribution of satisfactory goods and services at a fair price, while at the same time workers receive just wages and the plant or the construction contractor makes a suitable profit. Such education, to be most effective, needs to be closely co-ordinated with the occupational activities of each community. Instruction should be made available, for instance, in occupational analysis, in order to determine which of these elements are to be taught in school and which should be mastered in practice on the job. Advisory committees, composed of representatives of management and employees, moreover, can assist in the definition of what should be taught in the plant and what is appropriate to teach in a public-school vocational program.

It must be remembered, too, that apprentice training and the upgrading of workers are accomplished by education. While many

of our industries have excellent training departments, they cannot hope—nor is it fair to expect it—to furnish the complete education programs. The training departments of industry are always in close communication with the school, not only to supplement the training that is given in the plant training department, but also to assist in identifying other kinds of training for workers that should be undertaken and the content of such training.

Vocational schools through their trade and industrial co-ordinators at all times must be prepared to teach the basic skills and related knowledge required by industry: occupational preparation in basic skills and related instruction required by apprentices, and skills and related instruction through extension programs for journeymen workers. In other words, the curriculum in any vocational school must be determined by the occupational needs of the workers of the community. In supervisory training, vocational education must be able to furnish people who can lead foremanship training conferences and must pay special attention to the training of conference leaders for industrial and distributive organizations.

The relationship of vocational education to the training problems of the community is not limited to trade and industrial education. The training of workers in the field of distribution is receiving increased attention by vocational educators. Such training would teach salespersons and other distributive workers to render intelligent and helpful service in their contacts with the ultimate consumer. Through a sequence of appropriate courses for the different occupational levels, vocational skills and knowledge required for successful functioning in the different distributive occupations are developed. We can appreciate the great importance of such training to the community, state, and nation when we reflect that the full operation of our factories and the welfare of consumers depend upon efficient distribution of the products of industry.

Job satisfaction and appreciation, increased usefulness and earn-

ing ability, advancement, stabilization, and permanency of employment are important outcomes of a vocational training program for distributive workers. Another valuable result is to reduce losses caused by business failures. A well-organized program of vocational training for managers and owners of small businesses will enable them to operate according to sound management policies and practices, thus helping to reduce the high rate of small business failures.

Looking at the operation of an industrial plant or a retail organization, we must take into consideration the large corps of office workers who keep the records of transactions and keep correspondence moving, filed, and up to date. The vocational-education forces have established programs of commercial training for these office workers.

These commercial departments have modern equipment and experienced and trained teachers in the various occupations. Courses in bookkeeping and accounting, stenography, and general clerical, office, and business-machine operation are being offered in these departments. Persons completing the above courses are prepared for competent employment in a modern office. The commercial departments of vocational schools must be conscious not only of the personnel and financial records of industrial plants, but of the different kinds of correspondence and interdepartmental memoranda, letters to employees, and general industrial correspondence.

The departments of homemaking are primarily concerned with training in nonwage-earning occupations. However, there is a relationship between homemaking and modern industry. Nutrition is being given increasing consideration as a factor vital to industry. Industry recognizes that the human equipment of a plant must be nourished properly to secure efficient production. The operation of lunchrooms and cafeterias will be only as effective as the food is well chosen with a view to nutritional value. Studies and

tests give positive proof that in many cases production increases, spoilage decreases, and workers report less fatigue and sleep better when good nourishment governs the operation of the plant lunch-room. It seems evident that in the homemaking department, as well as in all other departments of the school, there must be continuous co-ordination, not only in the home, but in the industries as well.

Vocational education must be closely and constantly in touch with industry in matters of safety. Safety does not consist simply of accident prevention on a specific job or on a particular piece of equipment. There must be a program of general safety education. It is not trite to say that every worker must be made safety conscious. General safety education consists of training persons to become interested in and deeply concerned with all physical hazards in any situation. Training in specific safety practices in the plant concerning the operation of a specific machine, safety in the street and in the home may naturally follow. It is almost as essential that the worker avoid accident in his home or in the street as it is in the plant. The result of such education for the great community of workers is profit, high wages, and human happiness.

Clarence L. Greiber is Director of the State Board of Vocational and Adult Education, State of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN ADULT EDUCATION

Leland P. Bradford

Adequate industrial relations are of concern not only to management and workers but to everyone in the community. This is so not merely because the flow of production and the spending power of workers affect the economic life of the community, but also because the degree of satisfying productivity experienced by the worker materially affects his own mental health and consequently the mental health of others. In so far as industrial conflicts, inadequate

pay, poor job placement, insufficient training, poor supervision, or other conditions of industrial work prevent the worker from achieving a true feeling of productivity, there is less than a healthy and complete adjustment upon his part not only toward his work but toward all other areas of living. The need for each individual to experience creative productivity is central to his complete adjustment to living. Deprivation of this need distorts home, family, and community adjustment and, thus, distorts the adjustment of others. The amount of mental ill-health produced by inadequate conditions of industrialism is staggering, and its effect upon American homes and communities is almost incalculable.

Industrial relations in our present complex society are no longer a matter of face-to-face interpersonal relations. The day has passed, for the most part, when industrial relations were of concern only to the individual employer and the individual employee. In this day of corporations, management is all too frequently nebulous because those who assume responsibility for management are themselves employees. This has brought about much of the present confusion regarding the role of the foreman. Management today is a complex hierarchical structure with increasingly intricate functions in relation to the employee. There is little remaining opportunity for face-to-face relations between the employee and the employer.

The worker himself has ceased in large measure to function as an individual in the area of industrial relations. Our complex industrial structure has brought about the organization of unions so that the worker as an individual is a member of the group meeting with a management group. Unions themselves have grown into a degree of complexity rivaling that of management. Thus, we find that industrial relations of the present and the future must be based on group relations rather than on individual relations. It is now only groups representing larger groups that meet in any face-to-face relations.

With this pattern of group relations as the basis of industrial

relations, there is yet no adequate preparation of people for group work. The literature and the training programs on leadership skills and techniques are almost entirely based on the concept of leadership as a method of herding and manipulating sheep, rather than as a method of promoting individual and group growth and of arriving at true group discussion and solution. We are still at a primitive stage in our awareness of the group process in our modern life and in our knowledge of the skills of leading and participating necessary for successful group work. Our concepts of industrial relations are still based too largely on beliefs in the efficacy of police control. We work with groups in the same way we work with individuals, failing to realize that the dynamics of the group process varies materially from the dynamics of individual nongroup behavior.

Thus far, we have seen the problem of industrial relations as much broader than typically perceived and as affecting more people than usually considered. We have come to realize that this problem is an integral part of our present world situation and thus is of major concern to every individual and every community in the country. Its solution cannot be made alone by management and workers. A successful solution will necessitate the active effort of all. We further realize that our skills of interpersonal relations in individual face-to-face situations are not sufficient, that we must develop skills as group members and leaders. This need for new skills highlights the need for new education and training.

It is more than tragic that we educate people as individuals only and expect them to operate as members of the highly complex interrelated and interdeveloped groups that make up our present world civilization. Nowhere does the child or the adult really gain an opportunity for guidance, experience, or training in becoming a group member or a group participant.

Obviously, the development of adequate industrial relations and the acceptance of the need for adequate relations by the community

as a whole must start in the preschool and go throughout all of education. Such education or training should develop the skill of the individual as a participating member of a variety of groups and the skill of the individual as a leader directing his efforts toward the growth of a group. This education should help the individual toward a full understanding of the principles of democratic group action and of the necessary interrelations of groups. It should help the individual to realize that the group process is not an end in itself but a process through which each individual may best realize his potential abilities, may best meet his individual needs, and may most easily secure the personal freedom which is his right.

But it is not sufficient to rest a program of industrial relations upon the education of youth. In the first place, problems are present and, unless adequately solved, can bring destruction to our pattern of living. Of equal importance is the fact that the education of the child cannot successfully be dissimilar to the other influences upon him, just as industrial training has discovered that the training of the foreman to be a "good" foreman is futile unless the forces above and below him encourage him to better techniques of leadership.

Spearheading educational aid to industrial relations must be a successful program of adult education. The service of adult education in this area can be manifold. It can:

1. Develop methods of group leadership and participation
2. Train community adults as leaders and group members
3. Establish, through the education of adults, a climate conducive to the learning by the child of the principles and the skills of the group process
4. Train workers as group members and leaders in the dynamics of the group process and in discussion methods
5. Work with management groups in developing in them better methods of group work
6. Assist in the training of supervisors and foremen
7. Develop through community adult-education discussion

groups an improved understanding of the importance to the community as a whole of adequate industrial relations

Leadership training is a growing movement throughout the country. Unfortunately, some of the programs are developing without adequate understanding of the group process or without effort to use such programs as a laboratory for further exploration into the group process. Such programs can be little more than a rehashing of the skills of autocratic and laissez-faire leadership with no awareness of the dynamics of democratic group growth.¹

¹ The Division of Adult Education Services of the National Education Association has been engaged during the past few years with the Research Center for Group Dynamics of Massachusetts Institute of Technology in exploring the processes of leadership training, in-service training, group meetings, and workshops. A workshop, projected jointly by these two groups, will be held this summer to which will be invited key leaders in labor, management, education, adult-education, and social-service groups for training in the group process. Columbia University and the University of California have been invited to serve as co-sponsors.

Leland P. Bradford is Executive Secretary in the Department of Adult Education, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND LABOR RELATIONS*

Donald J. Shank

The improvement of relations between labor and management is one of the most pressing domestic problems that faces the United States. With the broadening of social legislation at the federal and state level in the last twenty years, and with the consequent growth in the strength of labor unions, the need for better understanding on the part of all parties to industrial conflict has become imperative. The issues in labor-management disputes, which frequently affect the very life of the people of the nation, are not simple issues which can be solved by power and strength alone. The representatives of all parties concerned with industrial peace—labor, management, and the government, or the public—must come to the conference table with mutual confidence, with the best possible understanding of the issues, and with the best ideas for their solution.

As a matter of fact, the recent attention given to the field of industrial and labor relations does not represent a completely new development in higher education in this country. For many years schools of business administration in numerous institutions throughout the country have trained men and women to install and operate personnel programs. Research agencies in the fields of psychology and economics have been developed at several universities, such as Princeton and Yale, where intensive studies have been made of employer-employee relationships, primarily from the point of view of management. Such institutions as the Harvard School of Business Administration, the Wharton School, and other large schools of business have long given training in industrial relations. Such great technical institutions as Massachusetts Insti-

* This article is a digest of an article by the same author in 27 *The Educational Record* (October 1946), 412 ff.

tute of Technology and the California Institute of Technology have also undertaken research in this area.

In considering the implications of this expanding educational movement, particular attention will be given in this article to the experience at Cornell University, since it has been most widely publicized and since it is perhaps the most comprehensive. The questions which should be asked regarding the Cornell program should, to a greater or lesser degree, be asked of most of the other collegiate programs now under way. It is essential that educators understand fully what is being attempted in these new undertakings, how they developed, how they operate, and what their long-term social contributions may be. The following five questions are, therefore, proposed and are answered in terms of the Cornell experience.

1. Is there a body of information and experience on labor-management relationships that can be taught?

The curriculum which has been worked out at Cornell in co-operation with state leaders of government, labor, and management is a broad program in the social sciences. Ninety-seven hours of the 120 hours required for the degree, bachelor of science in industrial and labor relations, are prescribed. During the first two years, the student takes a heavy dose of the social sciences—American history, sociology, social psychology, economics, law, American government, labor economics. He also improves his communications skills by year courses in English and public speaking. He takes a special one-term course in accounting, which emphasizes the interpretation of financial statements. He has an opportunity to observe workers on their jobs in a required field course. With the exception of an orientation course and the courses in labor economics, foundations of law, and workers and jobs, all of the courses are those of other faculties, chiefly of arts and sciences. The prescribed program, at present, does not include any foreign

language or any science. The only formal mathematical training is accounting and statistics.

The technical and professional core of the program is given in the junior and senior years. In the junior year every student takes a course in business organization and management and a course in corporation finance. Every student takes a year course in the history of labor and labor-union organization and management. In addition to one year of statistics, there are required courses at the junior level in human relations in industry and administration.

In the senior year, a year's course in collective bargaining, mediation, and arbitration and a year's course in personnel management are supplemented with special one-term courses in legal and constitutional aspects of labor problems and social insurance, in social security, and in public relations.

Although most of the advanced work is offered by the teaching staff of the school, certain courses are given by the College of Engineering and the School of Business and Public Administration.

Persons who have had little direct contact with industrial and labor relations will be surprised at the substantial literature which has developed in recent years in this field. In addition to comprehensive studies in economics, political science, psychology, sociology, and anthropology, there is a great wealth of material in the contracts which have been negotiated by thousands of unions and companies throughout the country. There is also a growing literature within the organized-labor movement that is of significance both to the workers themselves and to management. At Cornell these materials are being brought together. Where no teaching materials already exist, the staff is building materials from the current legislative developments at the state and federal levels and from the reports of labor and management groups and institutions.

2. Should colleges and universities attempt to develop programs in this field?

As pointed out earlier, many institutions have already been active in one or another aspect in the field of industrial and labor relations. Some universities have developed programs aimed at the training of personnel for management. Others have attempted to help workers in their dealing with employers.

The Cornell program, unlike those of many institutions, was designed from the beginning to serve equally the needs of government, labor, and management. Any college which hopes to achieve this difficult goal must be certain that all three groups are given fair representation in the control of the institution, that the staff is chosen to assure fair consideration of all points of view, and that students are selected who are concerned with all aspects of industrial and labor relations.

3. Can those interested in government, labor, and management be taught in the same institution?

Many social critics decried the idea that the Cornell school could offer a single required program that would be meaningful for those who would in future years sit at various sides of the conference table as representatives of management or of labor or of government. The experience of the first year of operation at the school has strengthened the opinion of all concerned with the venture that this not only can be done, but that it makes for better teaching and learning.

4. How can nonacademic problems in industrial and labor relations be presented in a training program?

No one at Cornell believes that all of the answers to all of the problems in industrial and labor relations can be solved in the classroom. The curriculum is accepted as a starting point for more intensive practical consideration of the problems in this area as they emerge in industrial life. The school utilizes two techniques to assure attention to the actual problems of industrial and labor relations.

In the first place, outstanding leaders from government agencies, labor unions, and management regularly visit the school for in-

tensive give-and-take discussions with the students. During the past year at least two, and frequently as many as four, visitors a week came to the University for periods ranging from a few hours to several days.

The second major means by which students are brought into contact with actuality is the summer work-training program. Every undergraduate student in the school is required to spend three summers at work. During the first summer, if he has not had previous factory experience, he gets a job in an industrial or commercial organization. During his second and third summer, he is assigned to an opening in a governmental, labor, or management organization. Each student must, before graduation, have spent one summer working with labor and one with management.

5. What will be the potential social contribution of the students of the school?

The school does not believe that its limited number of graduates will solve all of the problems of industrial and labor relations in New York State. The school does believe, however, that its students will go into government service, into labor unions, and into industrial and personnel offices within corporations with a better understanding of the rights and responsibilities of all parties in industrial relations.

Donald J. Shank is Director of Student Personnel, New York State School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.

GRADUATE TRAINING IN LABOR RELATIONS

John T. Dunlop

There is no royal road to the industrial-relations market. No distinct profession can yet be said to exist. A cluster of related "experts" and officers charged with making decisions comprise the field—union officers and staff, personnel directors and staff, arbitrators, labor lawyers, counselors, government employees, writers

and newsmen, and college professors. Each of these groups, with the exception of labor leaders, achieves a broad training and background as a preliminary to specialization in industrial relations.

The universities have made some contribution to the training of personnel in the field of industrial relations, as broadly defined, although there have been no graduate schools of industrial relations. The problems of the field are treated as parts of other disciplines: law, public administration, business administration, and the graduate faculties of economics, government, psychology, and sociology. Competency is required within each of these broad fields with a specialty in those aspects of industrial relations which are relevant to the established discipline. A labor economist or labor lawyer is given formal training primarily as economist or lawyer with special interest in those aspects of industrial relations which touch economics or law. Nowhere have the problems of industrial relations as a whole been considered as the locus for graduate training.

The universities must give serious attention to an issue which may be expected to become more insistent over the next generation. Shall separate schools for graduate instruction in industrial relations be established to correlate with instruction in law, business, and public administration? The flexible arrangements within universities permit a great many different shades of emphasis in answering the question. But in any discussion of appropriate policy the following factors will need to be appraised:

1. The demands of the various specialized markets for industrial-relations personnel are certain to shape the form of university instruction. Recruitment policies may be decisive. Are business personnel-department staffs to be recruited largely from those who have had a broad business experience? Are labor reporters to come from other than the ranks of newspapermen? Are staff officers of labor organizations to be hired from outside the labor movement? These questions are concerned with the extent of training provided

within the organizations and that made available in universities. Is it better training for a personnel-department staff member to have had a general business school training or a comprehensive course directed toward industrial-relations problems as a whole? Is the training of labor-relations personnel to resemble that of engineers, doctors, and lawyers where all types of organizations draw from a common pool trained in the graduate schools?

2. The field of industrial relations currently lacks any distinctive and cohesive discipline or tools. There is no common language. There is no agreement on conceptual schemes. Until such a common core has been developed, there would be little basis on which to build a distinctive graduate school in the field of industrial relations. There is danger that in the absence of rigorous techniques of investigation and conceptual apparatus there can be little way of developing careful thinking, a respect for facts, and an inquiring bent in graduate students. The training of an established discipline that is only partially relevant may be more helpful in developing students than the comprehensive study of labor relations in the absence of a rigorous discipline.

3. The specialized fields within industrial relations need broadly trained people. Ideally, they should have a deep understanding of a wide range of knowledge ordinarily encompassed by economics, law, government, psychology, and sociology. Moreover, they need an assortment of techniques—administrative practices, economic theory, statistics, group testing, etc. The field of industrial relations needs the contribution that widely differing authorities can make to its problems.

The universities are ill prepared at this time to launch training in a distinctive profession of labor relations, quite apart from the longer run possibilities of such instruction. In the years immediately ahead, however, there must be greater co-operation among existing departments. Students should be made aware of the fact that different disciplines have a contribution to make to training

in industrial relations although they may be well grounded primarily in one. There is need for research, joint conferences, and seminars that build slowly the area among the various disciplines. Joint seminars in law-economics, economic-sociology, business administration-public administration, etc., have made a beginning. While concentrating in an established discipline, candidates for advanced training can come at once to appreciate the breadth of the field and the rich contribution of the various approaches to the field. We are at the stage of exploration and research which must be a preliminary to any more ambitious longer run hopes.

John T. Dunlop is Associate Professor in the Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University.

THE UNIVERSITY'S CONTRIBUTION TO ADVANCED LABOR EDUCATION

John T. Dunlop and James J. Healy

A distinction must be drawn among four types of labor education. First, educational programs may be designed for the *rank and file* of union members. They are properly a part of the adult-education movement. The facilities of the unions and their experience in appealing to large groups of workers can provide the media for adult training for many deprived of the opportunities of formal education. The importance of the problems of collective bargaining present the challenge for an extensive program. The labor organizations and the extension services of universities have responsibility for this type of labor education.¹

Second, there is the training of *shop stewards and local officers*. This area is also the responsibility of the labor union and the extension divisions of universities. The universities can co-operate with special institutes designed to give intensive training to these local

¹ Mark Starr, "The Coming Revolution in Adult Education," 30 *Saturday Review of Literature* (February 8, 1947), p. 7.

representatives of a union who have ultimately most to do with the successful operation of the day-to-day processes of collective bargaining. Many of these institutes have made significant contributions.²

Third, there is need for training the technicians employed by labor organizations—lawyers, doctors, economists, statisticians, accountants, industrial engineers, and publicists. The regular professional schools of the country seem adequate for these purposes, although more attention needs to be given by the professional schools to the problems and opportunities in this field. The labor organizations, as large-scale enterprises, need to be better equipped and advised in dealing with technical problems. They need this technical assistance in dealing with management and public agencies. They owe it to the members they represent.

Fourth, the *staff officers* of labor organizations constitute a highly important cog in the functioning of the union and consequently an important area of labor education.

These different levels of education do not compete with one another. They are necessarily complementary and interrelated. A comprehensive program of labor education proceeds from the dual premises that, as a part of the democratic community, the labor movement requires the highest possible level of enlightenment among its members, and that it needs to bring to the top the most capable and devoted leadership it can inspire. Formal education may make a significant contribution to this process of developing leadership. It cannot perform the whole function; it must be a part of a larger program. This paper will deal with the educational potentials for one group: the staff officer.

The staff officer

The staff officer constitutes a new office in the development of labor organizations. He is a product primarily of the last twenty-

² See Caroline F. Ware, *Labor Education in Universities* (New York: American Labor Education Service, Inc., 1946), Appendix IV, for a summary report of such institutes.

five years. The growth of large labor organizations, the centralization of authority in the international office, the character of the modern corporation with which the union must deal, and the growing importance of public agencies all have been factors tending to create the necessity for the staff officer. He represents the emergence of professionalism in the labor movement.

The duties of the staff officer are impressive. A job description might run as follows: supervises the local unions in his district; directs organizing campaigns for new members; handles public relations with the press and other community organizations; conducts negotiations with management; assists management in working out special and emergency problems; has general responsibility for the proper disposition of union funds; conducts strikes with responsibility for the care of members and the tactics of the operation; may have responsibility for relationships with political candidates and organizations; presents the union's viewpoint to legislative bodies; handles a multitude of relations with administrative agencies; presents cases to arbitration boards; prepares reports for the international office; directs the strategy of the district in international conventions.

The staff officer must be a combination of an economist, accountant, industrial engineer, negotiator, publicist, administrator, lawyer, politician, and trouble shooter. This is the type of job that cannot be learned in the classroom. The textbook cannot transmit the type of experience and judgment required for this office.

The contribution of the university

Nonetheless, the university may make a significant contribution to the broad program of training for the executive responsibility of the staff officer. There are few places outside of the university that have the diversified group of specialists and experts to provide instruction on topics as comprehensive as job evaluation, incentive systems, accounting, collective bargaining, labor law, human

relations, and social psychology. Instruction in these varied fields cannot be given by a single man. These aspects of the work of the staff officer are changing so fast that specialists are required to keep fully abreast of developments. Moreover, few places outside of the university can accumulate the materials and documents that are a requisite to adequate instruction in this area.

These unique facilities permit the staff officer to gain from the university a comprehensive acquaintance with many of these techniques. Blind spots in his experience can be removed. He will know where to go for assistance in the future. While accounting and job evaluation and other techniques need be approached with care, the staff officer equipped with some understanding of the basic ideas and limitations will be more competent to perform his arduous and complex duties.

The university provides an atmosphere that allows the staff officer to reflect and to organize his own experience. He teaches himself. Freed from the obligations of a whirl of day-to-day activity, he is enabled to put his own experience in order and to formulate general conclusions and principles. Ideas and practices that were merely intuitive are made conscious and systematized. This process takes place through reading and discussion with other staff officers and members of the faculty.

The process of policy making and administration can be enlightening for the staff officer. The systematic analysis of the factors entering into decisions concerning policy in the actual experience of labor unions, through a study of specific cases, usually proves stimulating and enlightening. The careful appraisal of conflicting factors within labor organizations and in the world of management and the larger community helps to develop the attitude of problem solving. All intelligent decision making involves the study of alternatives.

The instruction for staff officers cannot be regarded as "graduate work" by the usual standards of a university. Neither is it strictly

comparable to undergraduate work. There really is no adequate basis for classifying this type of labor education in the accustomed hierarchy. Such instruction covers the whole range from the most elementary to the most advanced problems of policy making.

Mention must be made of the fact that the presence of staff officers serves as a stimulating experience to the university community as well. Problems of collective bargaining for the other students are made clearer and more realistic. These union officers provide a wholesome break to the intellectual processes of generalization. They encourage the collection of source materials and stimulate the research of the university staff.

The task ahead

This type of education represents a new venture for both the universities and the unions, and consequently a number of new problems must be solved within both organizations. There must be a wider recognition in the labor unions of the necessity and opportunity for this type of education. The staff officers who would profit most from these programs must be selected and sent to the universities. Suitable arrangements must be made to spare the most valuable men from the staff during the period of formal education. Their financial arrangements must be regularized. Unions must organize their staffs so as to profit most from the investment in education. The universities must more readily understand the needs of the unions and present more forcibly and effectively the opportunities available. Programs of instruction and methods of teaching suitable for these men of experience need to be developed.

Let it be clear that labor leaders cannot be created by university education; that task belongs to the union alone. In a total program of drawing forth and stimulating the promising younger men in an organization, the university may make a contribution. It can provide both technical training and the opportunity for reflection. These opportunities can be significant for the heavy responsibility

which the staff officer of the union bears for the union membership and the wider community. If the universities of the country are to fulfill their traditional obligation to the wider community, they must formulate, in co-operation with labor organizations, programs for the union staff officer. Moreover, to make an effective contribution in this type of labor education, the universities as a group cannot neglect to participate in the programs for the larger area of training union members and local officers.

James J. Healy is Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Public Administration and Executive Director of the Harvard Trade Union Fellowship Program, Harvard University.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND RESEARCH IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Helen Baker

Research has long been an accepted part of education at the graduate level. Learning to seek out information on historical developments, to explore basic problems and attitudes, and to weigh accepted practices and common experience against theory and propounded techniques and standards is an important aspect of the intellectual growth of the social scientist. The information gained and disciplines learned in the preparation of a major research study are of similar value to the student looking forward to a vocation in industrial relations.

Most universities or colleges offering instruction in the field of industrial relations have required some research on the part of their graduate students. Much substantial research, often in the form of a master's or a doctoral thesis, was done by students in this field years before the establishment of any university industrial-relations section or center. Prior to the development of these or similar university research organizations specializing in industrial relations, research was, however, likely to be rather narrowly de-

partmentalized. Graduate schools of business administration, in so far as they included problems of human relations in their curriculum, tended to stress research in personnel administration; economics departments offered graduate courses in labor economics and trade-unionism, and departmental theses were usually written in those fields; the sociologists studied industrial employees en masse or as parts of a social structure, but gave comparatively little attention to the specific problems involved in the employer-employee relationship. The various industrial-relations centers now set up in nineteen or more universities in the United States and Canada were almost invariably undertaken with the triple aim of broadening the area of teaching and research in industrial relations, integrating the previously divided approaches to the subject, and relating both instruction and research more closely to current problems.

No discussion of the aims of these sections can omit reference to C. J. Hicks, who was directly responsible for the inauguration of the Industrial Relations Section at Princeton University, and influential in the establishment of a number of others. In his *My Life in Industrial Relations*,¹ Mr. Hicks wrote:

Here is a field where universities can render most helpful service to their students and to the public, once they realize its importance. If the strong and weak points of an employer-employee relations and of labor unionism and of labor legislation are to be fairly and fearlessly studied, that work can be done only by those who are disinterested as well as competent, who have no selfish interests to serve, and who are trusted by all concerned. Universities are well qualified to render this service, provided they will show the same thoroughness and impartiality that have characterized their work in other fields of research.

The objectives stressed by Mr. Hicks have been, in most instances, the principal objectives of the nineteen industrial-relations divisions. Their establishment has provided the framework for a more unified and continuous study of labor relations and personnel prob-

¹ New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941.

lems within the individual universities. They have accumulated and made available to the student researcher increasingly rich library resources.

Various methods of integrating research and instruction

The extent to which industrial-relations research is directly related to graduate instruction varies from university to university. In almost all cases, some semi-independent research in the form of a thesis is part of the requirement for a higher degree. Acceptable thesis subjects usually are ones that require field work as well as substantial research in library resources. The value to the student depends to a considerable extent on the quality of the supervision and of the standards set in regard to thoroughness of research and competency in presenting the findings. The thesis research is more often vocational in the broad sense of encouraging growth in the ability to accumulate information on a specific subject and appraise it in the light of historical and current perspectives than in the sense of training in particular techniques.

In addition to training in research through preparation of a thesis, a number of universities offer part- or full-time research assistantships to graduate students or as immediate postgraduate training. Such assistantships are likely to carry with them more thorough training in research methods than the preparation of a thesis entails. Specific research methods vary according to the type of research emphasized by the organization or by the individual professor supervising the student.

The research assistants of the Industrial Relations Section at Princeton have included, in recent years, a few who have just received the doctoral degree, some with a year or two of graduate work, and a few veterans who had had no previous graduate training but had had experience in industrial personnel work prior to military service. The research assistants are considered as internes in industrial relations. A graduate course each term, independent

reading, and participation in the economics and labor-relations seminars are considered part of their training, along with bibliographical and research work under the supervision of one or another of the permanent members of the staff responsible for the research program. The internships range from one to two years. It is expected that in that time the assistant will have become acquainted with principal sources of information in the field, will have developed considerable judgment in selecting the best material for specific uses, will have gained facility in interviewing, and will have learned to recognize and handle with some skill the problems involved in the various steps of preparing a factual report. Not the least valuable part of the training period is the opportunity for the "interne" to develop his own opinions and judgment through wide reading and direct contact with leaders in industry, labor, and government.

Similar opportunities for "training on the job" as research assistants exist in other universities. The Industrial Relations Section of the California Institute of Technology offered, on an experimental basis, two research fellowships during the year 1940-1941.

The Industrial Relations Center of the University of Chicago stated in its 1946 annual report in regard to graduate student participation in the work of the center:

During the past year, provision was made for graduate student participation in most of the activities of the Industrial Relations Center. This embraced four areas: on-going research projects, union programs and management programs sponsored by the Center, and the work of the Industrial Relations Center Library.²

It is evident that the participation in the research program of graduate students or outstanding young men already employed in industry is of value both to the students and to the research organization. However, anyone with experience with such an arrange-

² *Annual Report Year Ending June 30, 1946* (Chicago: The University of Chicago, Industrial Relations Center), pp. 23-24.

ment knows also that to secure the greatest benefits, competent and regular supervision is essential. The organization must accept the training nature of the program and either through individual supervision or group discussion or, preferably, both help the young assistant to develop ability in research methods, sound judgment, and self-appraisal.

Areas of research

Projects in industrial-relations research in universities have covered almost every aspect of this subject. Current projects are equally varied. The studies reported in process in 1946 ranged from methods of indexing provisions of collective agreements to the government of American trade unions; from determinants of employer hiring policies and seniority problems to the social structure of industrial and business organization; from job analysis to a restatement of wage theory. The total current research in the labor field appears even more impressive when account is taken of such items as statistical series and short-range studies concerned principally with current operating problems, which were excluded from the Committee's summary.³

Individual institutions are likely to select specific areas of labor relations and employee-employer relations upon which their research will be concentrated over a period of time. The principal broad areas of interest are labor economics, trade-unionism, personnel administration, and the sociological-psychological approach to human relations in industry. The tendency today is to undertake a series of related studies bearing on different aspects of a specific broad problem or phenomenon, such as employee security, the adjustment of the individual worker to his industrial environment, technological change, wage determination, or the function-

³ *Memorandum on University Research Programs in the Field of Labor* (Washington: Committee on Labor Market Research of the Social Science Research Council, February 1946), p. iii.

ing of a particular labor market, and, in the development of these studies, to use all available social-science disciplines.

As mentioned earlier in this article, one aim of many of the university industrial-relations sections is to integrate, co-ordinate, and give leadership to all research within the given university relevant to industrial relations. The Committee on Labor Market Research of the Social Science Research Council serves in a similar capacity in inter-university planning. The result of these efforts toward better intra-university and inter-university co-ordination of industrial-relations research should be the more effective utilization of permanent members of university research staffs and of the temporary "in-training" research assistants.

The value of research to instruction in industrial relations

Research in industrial relations strengthens graduate training in this field through its impact upon the instructors as much as through the opportunities for growth afforded the students. Research involving direct observation of or experience in industrial situations gives the present or the future teacher a wider understanding of the bases of and points of view involved in major issues; it also gives him a better background for interpreting future developments. The annual reports of the Industrial Relations Section of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology have repeatedly referred to the importance of research and industrial experience both to the teacher and to the student. The Eighth Annual Report, for instance, mentioned the Section's "insistence on the value of continuous practical 'field work' as the only possible basis for realistic teaching in our field."

The research in which the students participate not infrequently results in materials of considerable help to classroom discussion of current developments. Textbooks cannot be kept up to date in such a rapidly changing field, and the reports or studies on which students have worked may provide important supplementary reading

in many courses. Projects on which students help to collect and prepare "case material" may provide materials for improved instruction for later students.

The contact with actual problems confronting the industrial-relations executive or the union leader also helps the student to gain insight into his own personal reaction to current developments and the means of handling them. This is a special kind of vocational guidance and one of the best ways of aiding the graduate student to decide whether he wants to enter the profession through teaching, research work, personnel administration, or to work with a union or government agency.

Whichever entry the student may choose, the research experience should stand him in good stead. Besides the contact with real situations which facilitates the transition from the role of student to that of a full-time practitioner in a self-chosen occupation, much of the information and many of the skills learned as a research assistant will be useful in almost any of the great variety of jobs in industrial relations. The ramifications of industrial-relations problems are so broad that some know-how in seeking out sources of information, some ability to weigh practice against theory, and some understanding of the interrelated economic forces and human relations involved are an essential minimum supplement to the information gained through formal instruction.

Helen Baker is Associate Director of the Industrial Relations Section, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey.

AREAS AND SERVICES OF UNIVERSITY EXTENSION IN INDUSTRIAL-RELATIONS PROGRAMS

Baldwin M. Woods and Abbott Kaplan

The problem of what are the legitimate or desirable areas of operation and services to be rendered by university extension in an industrial-relations program must inevitably hinge upon the objectives of the university program.

Recent years have witnessed the establishment of increasing numbers of industrial-relations institutes and centers at universities throughout the country. Some, particularly the private institutions, are primarily interested in research and resident programs involving comparatively small numbers of students.

For state or municipal institutions the problems posed are somewhat different. When industrial-relations programs were established at these institutions by the boards of regents or by special acts of the respective state legislatures, it was because of the growing concern with the problems arising from disturbed industrial relations and the effect of industrial disputes on the public welfare. In most instances the proposed plans at the state universities envisaged a threefold program: a research and information service; undergraduate and graduate training in labor problems and industrial relations; and a state-wide extension service in industrial relations. Little difficulty has been experienced in clarifying the objectives or functions of the university in the first two aspects of the program—research and academic training. In the third area, however, that of extension services in industrial relations, considerable difference of opinion is apparent concerning the areas and functions to be assumed by university extension.

University extension courses as such are not new, of course, and

like the regular campus academic program have tended to conform to a fairly traditional pattern. When industrial-relations institutes were established providing for extension services, it was thought in some quarters that the courses offered in industrial relations should follow the established patterns of the courses offered in other fields; that industrial-relations courses paralleling the regular university courses be made available in extension to management, labor, and the general public on the same basis as other extension courses. Advocates of this approach maintain that by thus providing for the joint participation of management and labor in the same classes a greater understanding of each other's viewpoints is effected; their community of interest becomes apparent and the desired harmonious relations are on the way to being achieved. They further point out that the presence of representatives of both labor and management creates more stimulating discussion and a more effective learning situation.

Opposed to this view are those who believe that the establishment of institutes of industrial relations and extension programs in industrial relations provide a unique opportunity for a far-reaching labor-education program so sadly lacking in this country in the past. They feel that the educational needs of labor are distinctive and cannot be served by the typical university extension course. They point out that university faculty members have little success in teaching workers who have had limited schooling and who are unaccustomed to academic methods. Workers, they claim, are repelled by the typical schoolroom atmosphere and would be more likely to attend classes or discussion groups in their own union halls or in centers to which they are accustomed. It is further maintained that the presence of management representatives serves merely to inhibit the freedom of expression of workers who tend to have less educational training and background. In regard to the argument that university extension cannot cater to a particular group within the community but must make its offerings available

to all segments of the population, proponents of the undiluted labor-education program state that is precisely why special classes for workers should be established. For many years, they insist, university extension has been servicing management through its business and commerce courses, whereas very little has been done to serve the needs of labor. The time has now come, they feel, to render equal service to labor.

It was stated at the outset that the areas of operation and the services to be rendered by university extension in an industrial-relations program hinge upon the university's objectives in launching such a program. In general, regardless of minor differences in objectives, state universities, in establishing extension programs in industrial relations, have been motivated by the desire to develop well-equipped and better trained leadership within employer organizations and labor unions and to develop a more informed and intelligent citizenry in the area of industrial relations.

On the controversial issue of whether university extension offerings should be participated in jointly by representatives of labor and management or whether separate labor-education services should be provided for labor unions, University Extension of the University of California takes the position that the matter is not correctly stated in "either-or" terms. It is felt that its guiding purpose must be the mandate of the state legislature and the university authorities to develop better trained leadership and a better informed citizenry.

The majority of labor unions are of democratic organization. The leadership of labor unions represents the thinking of its members. The training of labor leaders unaccompanied by systematic education of union members in the meaning of trade-unionism and their responsibilities as good union members may prove entirely fruitless. Hence, as citizens and particularly as union members, the membership of labor unions merits the attention and services of university extension.

If the assumption is granted that university extension should reach rank-and-file union members as well as union leaders, the question of whether joint management-labor courses or separate courses to each group should be offered becomes academic. In practice, rank-and-file union members simply do not attend typical university extension courses in industrial relations.

To achieve the general objectives stated by the California State Legislature in establishing an Institute of Industrial Relations, University Extension is embarking on a flexible program designed to reach all segments of the population by whatever means prove most practicable. In some instances courses are attended by representatives of both labor and management as well as other interested citizens; in others, courses are offered directly to managerial personnel in plants or to union members in union halls or other meeting places of their own choosing.

The following is a summary of the services being rendered and those contemplated for the near future by the extension services of the Institute of Industrial Relations at the University of California at Los Angeles:

In progress

1. Courses in industrial relations at the University Extension Center in Los Angeles leading to a Certificate in Industrial Relations. Most of the courses parallel campus courses and may be taken for university credit. A minimum of eight courses is required for the certificate. These classes are presently attended by representatives of management, labor, governmental agencies, and persons planning to enter the industrial-relations field, as well as other interested citizens. Some of these courses are offered in other parts of the state as well. Among the courses offered for the certificate are the following:

Principles of Economics	Labor Law and Legislation
Labor Economics	Grievances and Arbitration
Industrial Relations	Personnel Management
History and Problems of the	Industrial Management
Labor Movement	Statistics

Work Simplification and
Time Study
Wage Rate Analysis

Social Insurance
Workmen's Compensation
Job Evaluation

2. Courses in industrial plants for supervisory personnel, members of industrial-relations departments, and for shop foremen.

3. Courses in trade-union halls for elected officials, business agents, shop stewards, and rank-and-file members.

4. An annual conference on industrial relations to which representatives of labor, management, government, and the public are invited. The first was held in March 1947. The topics for discussion at the conference include the following:

Industrial Disputes and the Public Interest
The Government Role in Industrial Relations
Collective Bargaining and Economic Progress
Wage-Price-Profit Relationships
Prerequisites of Industrial Peace

Planned

5. A list of speakers on industrial relations and labor problems is being prepared for civic organizations, church groups, and women's clubs.

6. A one- or two-week resident labor institute is being planned for the summer of 1947.

7. A weekly radio program on industrial relations in which representatives of labor, management, and the public will participate is also contemplated.

Before concluding it may be well to point out that regarding the contention that labor education or courses in industrial relations of a nonacademic, less formal nature, if offered at all by a public agency, should be offered by the public-school adult-education division, our feeling has been simply that, regardless of the reasons, few public-school systems to date have attempted programs in this area. Where local public-school systems are prepared to offer courses in industrial relations or labor education the Institute of Industrial Relations is ready to co-operate with them in establishing such a program to be sponsored jointly with the Institute or by the

school system alone. Actually a proposal of this nature has already been accepted by one of the large school systems in California.

The area of industrial relations is a crucial one in the social, political, and economic life of the nation. It bids fair to remain so for many years to come. University extension can make a significant contribution to the general welfare by developing those services and channels that will provide the greatest amount of intelligence and information on the subject to the broadest sections of the population by whatever means at its disposal. While the areas and services cannot be blueprinted in detail, one thing is certain. University extension must be prepared to pursue a flexible and experimental course if it is to be successful in its industrial-relations program.

Baldwin M. Woods is the Director of Extension, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Abbott Kaplan is Head of Extension Services, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, Los Angeles, California.

UNIVERSITY EXTENSION AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN WISCONSIN

Lorentz H. Adolfson

The University Extension Division of the University of Wisconsin performs two basic functions: first, it is the agency that fills in the gaps in the formal educational pattern of the state; and, second, it is the "transmission belt" for carrying university services of all kinds to the people of the state in their homes and local communities. Thus, the Extension Division may be said to operate on a campus co-extensive with the boundaries of the state.

To perform such functions adequately, university extension must constantly explore the educational needs of adult, or out-of-school, groups and seek practical means, both inside and outside the structure of the university itself, to serve those needs. In Wisconsin, the

University Extension Division and the state system of vocational and adult education together go far to meet the educational needs of adults everywhere in the state.

In recent years the problems in the field of industrial relations have pressed increasing demands for educational services on university extension. At Wisconsin, we have avoided formulating a rigid pattern of approach to the problems in this field. On the contrary, we have developed special activities to meet the varying educational needs in such widely diversified areas as worker education, industrial management, labor-relations and personnel practices, and community problems pertaining to industry and commerce.

The oldest of our current approaches to the problem of industrial relations is the School for Workers, which is now entering its twenty-third year of direct educational service to organized labor. The activities of this school center primarily around a program of summer resident institutes in Madison, attended by workers selected and generally financed by labor unions themselves. These institutes are supplemented by a limited educational and consultative service to labor groups throughout the state during the winter months. The school has been projected co-operatively by the University and the state's organized labor movement.

The School for Workers is not vocational; it is a program of studies and consultative services related to the group needs of workers—needs expressed by the workers themselves. Classes are offered: (1) in tool subjects such as labor journalism, parliamentary law, public speaking, and the use of audio-visual materials; (2) in general subjects such as shop-steward training and grievance procedures, principles and practices in collective bargaining, labor legislation, general economics, trade-unionism history, industrial psychology, and union administration; and (3) in special subjects such as time and motion study, job evaluation, pay incentives, economics of the industry.

The program of the Wisconsin School for Workers is made available directly to labor groups for two basic reasons. First, from the point of view of sound educational tradition and experience, the most effective teaching job is done in the friendly atmosphere of a homogeneous group, with a common background of experience and training. A second reason, based on the obvious fact that good industrial relations grow out of a democratic balance between functioning equals, is the need of workers for aid in the development of an internally healthy trade-unionism, which can be achieved best by direct educational service.

On the management side the Extension Division and the School of Commerce, with the co-operation of the Wisconsin Manufacturers' Association, have presented during the past three years a series of Industrial Management Institutes. The objectives of these one-week institutes, held almost continuously during the academic year, are: (1) to educate and train executive and supervisory personnel to recognize more clearly and carry out more effectively their duties and responsibilities as an integral part of management; (2) to assist industry's time-study engineers, comptrollers, and other technical employees in the establishment of sound, scientific methods in industrial plants and offices; (3) to sponsor a continuous improvement in human relations in industry; (4) to develop in management personnel the better qualities of leadership; and (5) to develop a better understanding of our free enterprise system and its needs. These institutes are an effort by the university to help Wisconsin industry meet a multiplicity of industrial-personnel problems and, from a long-range point of view, to help develop effective industrial leadership.

On the more formal side the Department of Business Administration of the Extension Division has for many years been supplying services in the field of industrial relations through correspondence study, credit and noncredit classes over the state, and one- or two-day institutes. The department also works closely with the

residence School of Commerce in helping to promote and organize conferences for particular industries or trade associations dealing with topics of interest in the industrial-relations field.

Cutting across the lines of both labor and management in this field are two activities in the University Extension Division. First, there is the work of the Bureau of Industrial and Applied Psychology, the chief function of which is to supply information, teaching, and research services on personnel relations in industry. Research and institute activities center around problems of job analysis and the selection and training of workers. At the present time, this bureau is directing much of its effort toward the development of vocational counseling services as community enterprises. The activities of this bureau are an attempt to make available the most modern psychological techniques in the fields of testing, counseling, personnel work, and industrial relations to all interested groups, whether management, labor, or public.

The second of these service bureaus is the Bureau of Community Development through which community-wide local programs, emphasizing a public point of view, are developed with the co-operation of both employers and employees. In recent years, the activities of this bureau have included assistance to local communities in postwar planning; the organization of a state-wide advisory committee on postwar problems, including representatives from both management and organized labor; the promotion of state and regional forums in which industrial leadership and labor leadership co-operated in promoting sound planning to prevent mass unemployment; the establishment of seventy-eight community organizations for the consideration of questions affecting local patterns of employment and production; and the organization of forums on industrial relations and other economic problems. In this way, the university has sought to assist local communities in tackling their local economic problems on as broad a front as pos-

sible, with the assistance of labor, management, and interested lay groups.

The field of industrial relations is so broad and varied that, from an educational service point of view, it should be approached pragmatically. On the one hand, it is essential that all groups interested in the various problems of industrial relations be reached by whatever means possible. On the other hand, it is equally important to attempt to work out techniques for reaching often opposing groups in such a way as to bring them together for serious discussions of their mutual problems. But to us at Wisconsin it seems important not to freeze a particular theory or pattern of how to approach the problems of industrial relations. Our experience, in residence as well as in extension, indicates that too much emphasis on theory may lead to endless disputes over the theory at the expense of practical service.

Only by making a positive and continuing effort to reach and serve all groups concerned with the problems of industrial relations can real progress in this field be made. If a university will use and develop its extension facilities imaginatively and courageously, it will help immensely in the development of better informed and more skillful industrial and labor leaders for the critical years that lie ahead. Moreover, it will contribute significantly to the development of the broad public understanding of the major problems in the field of industrial relations, upon which, in large part, the stability of our society depends.

Lorentz H. Adolfson is Director of the University Extension Division, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

UNIONS LOOK AT EDUCATION IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Kermit Eby and Frank Fernbach

The growing interest of American universities and colleges in providing educational aid to the organized labor movement is a belated but heartening development. With few exceptions, such as the pioneer teaching of Wisconsin's John R. Commons, even the college student found little in the curricula a decade ago to help him understand, and later to cope with, the problems of working harmoniously with organized labor. While future management executives received meticulous training in production engineering, industrial finance, market analysis, and corporation law, the business of "getting along with labor" was, fantastically, left to chance. Many recent tensions might have been avoided if industry's leaders had received the practical knowledge and had gained the insights, as students, that are prerequisite to enlightened industrial relations.

Today a quarter-million American enterprises engage in collective bargaining with their employees, and our colleges are making efforts to provide more practical and up-to-date training for future management leaders. In addition, a score of well-staffed university industrial-relations centers have sprung up to give continuous service to industrial executives through research, consultation, and conferences on labor-management problems. Through these centers, hundreds of top management representatives gain knowledge and perspective by a continuing study of industrial relations.

Paralleling this effort is the growing interest of universities and colleges in training for union leaders. In the last half-dozen years, and in response to a diversity of objectives, more than fifty college

projects in labor education have been initiated or advanced to the drawing-board stage.

Even before the First World War, some unions had undertaken membership training programs of their own. In the twenties, evening classes were conducted in many industrial cities and several residence schools were started. Organized labor was then bitterly struggling for its right to exist and had few contacts with established educational institutions. Its own projects, financed entirely by unions and their liberal friends, led a precarious existence and many passed from the scene. But interest in education continued and grew, particularly after the rapid rise in membership that began in 1934, until today half of all C.I.O. and A.F. of L. international unions maintain permanent educational departments.

Union resources are proving too limited to provide the systematic educational programs that thousands of unionists are demanding and, as American universities and colleges show interest in labor education, union educational directors are turning toward their doors. Already for two decades midwestern unions have been using the facilities of the University of Wisconsin's School for Workers and, during the last two years, thousands of wage earners have attended the conferences, short summer courses, and evening classes of a growing number of college programs.

The labor movement is watching these developments with eagerness and with some apprehension. The problems confronting institutions that wish to serve usefully in this field are complex and challenging. It would be tragic if these valuable adult-education efforts fall short of their objectives and disappoint both the sponsoring universities and the wage earners for whom they are hopefully planned.

Educators must understand the deep-rooted suspicions of many wage earners. It must be remembered that organized labor has been forced, in many cases, to fight for existence in hostile communities where school boards and educators often reflected the antagonism

of business groups. Some unionists may be hard to convince that even institutions of higher learning are objective in their teaching. College faculties must face skeptical worker-students with tolerance and good nature, while they establish confidence that their instruction is not just subtle "propaganda" from management's point of view.

Labor will surely reject any project that it believes is to be imposed upon it. It is fundamental to the success of these services that union leaders participate continuously with educators in planning the policies and programs which are established for the instruction of their own members. Schools of union administration or labor-education centers, whatever their names, must give more than lip service to this principle, just as farm and industrial leaders have always received recognition of their special interest in the activities of colleges of agriculture and business administration.

While most leaders of industry and the professions are college trained before entering their adult careers, labor's leaders emerge from industry, often after little formal education. Long working experience, close association with wage earners and their needs, and qualities of leadership developed in the give-and-take of the "school of hard knocks" are the usual prerequisites of leadership in the labor movement.

It is evident that with rare exceptions neither local union officers nor top labor executives will be college graduates and, as a practical matter, unions are unable to send their leaders to school for extended periods of instruction. Therefore, institutions desiring to serve wage earners must adjust their programs to the requirements of the situation. While workers will come to the campus for conferences and for short summer schools that are timed to annual vacation schedules, the campus must reach out into our industrial communities to serve American wage earners where they work and live.

In developing these programs, our universities and colleges will

find a rich field for experimentation with new courses, materials, and teaching techniques. Training in specific detailed union organizational and administrative procedures is properly the function of the union itself. But in the broader study of industrial relations, labor legislation and history, economic and social questions, and practical training in public speaking, bookkeeping, and parliamentary procedure, the college program has an important part to play. To teach mature and skeptical adult workers, however, requires methods and materials different from those which may be effective in teaching youth. Abstractions and theory as such are to be avoided. Emphasis must rather be placed on practical situations and facts, from which, with wise guidance, general principles may emerge in discussion. Tact, imagination, and flexibility are required of the teacher of adult workers, and experience demonstrates that by no means do all successful college professors succeed with worker-students.

Not only do the union and the individual worker stand to gain from effective labor education, but the college gains as well. Faculty members who participate have an opportunity to study industrial relations and economic and social problems from life rather than from books. And their thinking will be enriched by contact with the practical experiences and realism of those who spend their lives as wage earners.

Both union and management students of industrial relations might be brought into direct contact at various points in the development of their own respective programs. By inviting management to at least some sessions of labor-education projects, and vice versa, the exchange of ideas in a friendly setting provides opportunities for patterns of group thinking and co-operative action to evolve.

Certainly there is no cure-all for the difficulties of industrial relations. But it is beyond question that the wide extension of the type of education discussed here will raise the objectives and ac-

tivities of both employers and unions. Surely the quiet undramatic forces of education are the most effective weapons for building co-operation and constructive attitudes.

The greatest obstacle to the development of permanent labor-education programs under university and college auspices is financial. In three or four states, funds have been obtained by grants of state legislatures; in most cases, interested school officials have had to draw from the general funds of their institutions to start programs. Everywhere financial support has been precarious and inadequate to meet the growing demand of organized labor for extensive and permanent educational services.

For many years, educational aids for the nation's farmers have been provided by the federally supported land-grant agricultural colleges, while training for industrial and professional leaders has been maintained by a vast system of public and private professional and business schools. Only labor among the large functional groups of our population has no broad public financial support for leadership training. This will be changed if Congress enacts the union-sponsored Labor Extension Service Bill which is being prepared for consideration in the present session. Under its provisions, a Labor Extension Service Division in the United States Department of Labor, comparable to the Agricultural Extension Service Division in the Department of Agriculture, will be established to provide federal grants-in-aid for labor extension programs under the auspices of colleges and universities throughout the country. The benefits of this program, both for labor and the nation, should assure its passage with broad bipartisan support.

In our democracy the labor movement has become spokesman for the aspirations of millions of wage earners. Institutions of higher education have a responsibility to this group equal to their obligation to any other. Our universities and colleges should be providing instruction and training for union leaders, and inspiration and guidance in the development of labor's truly American

objectives. Through such services, organized labor will be aided in developing knowledge of its rights and responsibilities in collective bargaining and, equally important, higher education will be more completely fulfilling its basic moral obligation—the development of the capacity of *all* people to serve in the task of enriching the life of the nation.

Kermit Eby is Director of the C.I.O. Department of Education and Research.

Frank Fernbach is on the staff of the United Steelworkers of America and C.I.O. Liaison Representative to the Committee for the Extension of Labor Education.

UNIONS LOOK AT EDUCATION IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Mark Starr

Workers' education and the study of industrial relations are receiving increased recognition in our colleges and universities. Education, exercising its normal role as the main intellectual supporter of the *status quo* is, however, only granting a somewhat belated recognition to the new strength and power of organized labor, which was the outstanding feature of the New Deal decade, 1933 to 1943.

Without unduly bemoaning the past, labor, when it looks at education in industrial relations, is compelled to recognize how slowly and reluctantly and ineffectively education has realized its responsibility in this field in relation to the largest section of our community. The fact that our public-school system and the majority of our universities did not recognize the educational needs of the labor movement as such; the control of vested interests over many institutions both state and privately supported; the "safety first" attitude of professors and college presidents who feared to endanger potential support from wealthy foundations—all these resulted in a weakness of organization among educators themselves, and a

preoccupation with setting up schools for business rather than schools for labor. To forget this unconscious bias on the part of education is to ignore the difficulties of this field which make more welcome the promising start now being made in a realistic study of industrial relations with labor as well as management being considered.

It is surely just as necessary to train good union leaders as it is to train business leaders. Civic sense and social intelligence are even more important in a union officer than in the man who is educated to sell stocks and bonds. While organized labor was looked upon as an Ishmael in our society, the educator could be excused for concentrating on the viewpoint of management in labor-management relations. Unfortunately there are still large segments of business in the United States that give only lip service to the Supreme Court's affirmation of the right of workers to organize. Some of our business corporations look longingly back to the period before the Wagner Act. If unions are recognized and invited to sit at the bargaining table and if the old psychology of conflict is replaced by one of co-operation, education in industrial relations has new opportunities.

There are several approaches in dealing with industrial relations, both in aim and in method. The approach typified by Senator Irving M. Ives in New York State is that labor schools should be set up in which joint study between the would-be representatives of management and of labor should be maintained as a preliminary to their later co-operation in the running of industry. This approach does credit to its pioneers, but obviously has its handicaps. There must, in my opinion, be an initial recognition of specific needs before such a joint study can be operated beneficially.

In some areas of the United States labor unions are still literally fighting for their lives. When two armies fight, their strategy and tactics are not discussed in joint meetings! Labor unions, under such conditions, are not likely to send in qualified representatives

to schools for joint study. Management in such areas continues with few exceptions to receive major consideration in education.

Unions have a right to expect education to set up institutes devoted to labor's specific problems. Courses should be outlined in a joint planning committee. It is utopian to think that union representatives can be released from their day-to-day responsibilities for a period of four years to graduate as "labor leaders." Once these needs have been outlined and met satisfactorily, then joint study would be feasible on many topics but not as a first step.

The Harvard Trade Union Fellowships are an attempt to get responsible active leaders selected and in part financed by the unions. These students are given specific labor courses and also participate in courses given to representatives of management.

In the matter of methods of teaching in industrial relations, it is obvious that the teacher who meets experienced men and women from industry will have a more exacting task than in facing inexperienced students. However, the task is a self-rewarding one to the good teacher who enriches his own knowledge as he helps his students to interpret their experiences. Union field work and participation in organizing campaigns and administrative work would be very helpful to a would-be teacher in this field. (Perhaps individual educators would learn how to improve their own economic status, because some union members, looking at what teachers and professors are paid, would hardly accept them as authorities in the practical job of elevating their economic standards of life.)

No educator should forget that industrial relations are not static. In an era of expanding industry, there is a different climate than in a period of unemployment and depression. Industrial relations will vary from industry to industry because of previous activity in the field. John L. Lewis shouts down his opponents because they once shouted him down. Some industries are intelligent enough to pay high wages in order to secure necessary incentives. Some employers have neither the capacity nor the ability to adopt new methods of

modernizing their plants. In other words, industrial relations lack the cool and scientific atmosphere of a zoology laboratory. Social engineering has not yet equipped itself with accepted formulas that can be written down in a scientific text. All the qualities of the good educator, of humility and willingness to recognize change in growth, are more necessary than ever in this field.

Timid trustees and dogmatic pedagogues will suffer high blood pressure in this field. Controversies and hot arguments are indispensable. Many educators will hear what they think to be economic heresies heatedly discussed and approved. Proposals for social change have a place in the study of industrial relations. The purposes of industry's motives and incentives should all be freely discussed for the sake of our mental and economic well-being.

The development of a larger over-all view seems to me essential. Labor looks to education in industrial relations to develop this over-all view and a social conscience. This is not a new idea but it deserves repetition. It means a shift from the ideal of individual advancement to that of service to the community. The ideals of unionism imply an emphasis upon the group rather than upon the individual worker. Social planning for freedom can be developed only when both labor and management are prepared to try new methods and new approaches. The study of industrial relations should provide guidance in this field.

Frederick J. Turner anticipated this when he maintained that education should stress the "ideal of service to democracy rather than of individual advancement alone."

Mark Starr is Educational Director of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union.

*MANAGEMENT ATTITUDES TOWARD
INDUSTRIAL-RELATIONS TRAINING*

**MANAGEMENT LOOKS AT EDUCATION IN
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS**

Leonard J. Fletcher

Good industrial relations involves dealing effectively with people. Education in this field misses the mark if it consists merely of cold analysis of human behavior or deep studies of theoretical economics. Successful industrial-relations men and women get results because they are basically suited for their work, are deeply interested in it, and have the proper education and work experience for their particular position.

It is well to define industrial relations before further discussing preparations for work in this field. It usually includes those activities having to do with employees, their various relations with each other and the company. Examples are employment and placement, training, medical services, insurance, safety, restaurant or food services, employee athletic and other activities, and job evaluation. Because industrial relations deals with people does not mean that all other activities in the company such as production, sales, credit, purchasing, engineering, etc., do not also have important human-relations problems. In most companies these various departments assign to their industrial-relations department only those of their personnel problems that can best be handled by one central department.

A study of the education of successful industrial-relations people would likely disclose every variety of experience and formal education. Some people, however, are basically better suited for this work than are others. Those considering entering the field of industrial relations should really like people, all kinds of folks, not just the "right" ones, and they should in return be liked by others. They

should be good listeners, yet know when and how to express themselves effectively. They should smile without trying—be tolerant, yet hold firmly to sound principles. They must be honest.

Anyone possessing a contrary nature seldom finds corrective courses in college. It is far more likely that the desirable characteristics described above are the result of the individual having successfully passed a five-year preschool course in theoretical and applied child development taught by loving, understanding, and unselfish parents.

Industrial-relations work, however, is no place for the playboy or the "hail fellow well met" chap who lives by quick wits alone. In this field there is much to learn and to keep learning. Both big and little problems demand quick and proper solutions.

Training for industrial or personnel work can be of many kinds and types. Certainly the individual's genuine interest in the field should top the list of qualifications. A real liking for the work must exist, not just a desire to get into a new, and supposedly better paying, activity.

College education may well supply a portion of the necessary training along one of the many avenues leading toward successful industrial-relations work. The college curriculum designed to prepare an individual in this field normally includes courses in economics, psychology, and sociology, with advanced or specialized courses in labor relations, industrial-personnel practices, etc.

Of great importance, however, is the ability to express oneself clearly and understandably. The language of the shop may not be that of the classroom. However, the "examination paper" of the industrial-relations man is graded in the shop. Here simple objective language is vitally important. It is not enough to have a good theoretical knowledge, for example, of industrial economics. It is important that such terms as profit, surplus, depreciation, net assets, etc., be reworked and expanded to bring out their correct meaning when discussing company finances with employee groups. Ability to speak and write in a manner suited to the listener or

reader is a number one "must" in industrial relations. Somewhere and somehow the ability effectively to convey ideas through the simplest language must be learned.

Many successful industrial-relations people have gained all their education through experience, planned reading, and observation, often through advancement from job to job in one company. It is a fundamental truth that no one *receives* an education. Everyone supplies himself the energy required to learn. Schools help by directing, guiding, and measuring, even more by inspiring and encouraging. Early actual business experience, especially while in college, if that is the chosen path, is most desirable. It gives substance to the classroom theory and serves well in later years.

A most desirable qualification in industrial-relations people is that of complete understanding. They should be able to place themselves in the position of the other fellow, look through his eyes and see his mind pictures. This comes through real work-experience in the business where firsthand knowledge is acquired. There is no substitute for the viewpoints gained when working as an employee of a factory, store, or other merchandising establishment. In fact, having to do this to earn a living is best of all.

Management has a definite responsibility in industrial-relations education. Employees, in fact the whole community, should be kept informed concerning all phases of the business affecting them. Teachers and pupils in local schools should be invited to visit the factory or merchandising establishment, ask questions and receive clear answers. Near-by college faculty members and students should be welcomed and given every opportunity to acquaint themselves with the facts of business life.

When employing a college graduate for industrial-relations work, it would surely seem a good investment to afford him a period of planned training to learn company practices and reasons for them. He should be scheduled for work on typical jobs long enough so that he knows the long-time feel of the work. A qualified man should be in charge of this training program to arrange the

work schedules, conference discussions, and special assignments. In a somewhat modified form, training should be provided those up-graded to industrial-relations jobs from other parts of the plant.

It is thus evident that the education required thoroughly to qualify a person for industrial-relations work starts very early in life and continues as long as the individual remains in this fast-changing field of activity.

When considering a person for this work, farsighted management will, therefore, look for those characteristics which are acquired early in life, for practical work experience, and for knowledge gained while in schools or through self-study. In any event, before any individual can successfully deal with the many and varied problems of employees, he must expect to gain a great deal of firsthand experience in the company with which he is associated.

Leonard J. Fletcher is Director of Training and Community Relations of the Caterpillar Tractor Company, Peoria, Illinois.

MANAGEMENT LOOKS AT EDUCATION IN INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Glenn Gardiner

A surprisingly large number of men and women who seek my advice and counsel about their careers say to me: "I feel certain I could qualify for a position in industrial relations or personnel. I have always liked to work with people."

A fundamental liking for people is a basic requisite for industrial-relations work. But the person who hopes to succeed in an industrial-relations career must have a more extensive background than the mere liking for people.

First of all, he must analyze his character and personality by asking himself such questions as "Can I handle people effectively?" "Can I give and take?" "Am I endowed with infinite patience,

tact, resourcefulness, and integrity?" Then, he must evaluate what knowledge he has on such subjects as industrial management, engineering, labor law, economics, and specific personnel techniques.

In the light of all these requirements, many persons become aware of their lack of preparation for industrial-relations work. Thereupon, they ask me, "Just how can I, then, prepare myself for an industrial-relations career?" Often, too, they add with some doubt and hesitancy, "Do you think there is a future in such work?"

My answer is that, undoubtedly, more opportunities in industrial-relations work exist today than ever before. This is underlined by the fact that the development of unions has focused more attention of top management on the necessity of developing good relations between management and labor. It does not appear that these problems will become simpler. Rather, so far as we can foresee, they will become more complex.

During the past generation, great emphasis has been put upon the development of the mechanical and technical side of industry. It is felt that technical and mechanical factors have been improved faster than our methods of dealing with the human factor. Now, we must turn our attention to the human factor. We must bring our human and industrial relations abreast of our mechanical progress. We must now, and in the future, devote the same intelligent genius to improving industrial relations that we devoted to mechanical improvements and inventions in the past thirty years.

Just what is the best path for a person to take who desires to get into the industrial-relations field is a difficult question to answer. Hardly two people in important personnel jobs today took the same route. No prescribed college course of study can furnish the complete answer. Very much depends on the type of individual involved. A combination of general college training and some practical experience in industry, however, are essential for any person whose aim is real success in industrial-relations work.

An ideal preparation would be a college course in industrial engineering that would combine the science of engineering with considerable electives in the fields of economics, elementary psychology, time study, costs, and industrial management. In fact, an engineering degree might carry somewhat more prestige so far as foremen and production heads are concerned than a liberal-arts education. But the most important function of such college training would be to teach a person to think.

Moreover, too many persons in industrial-relations work today are not nearly as effective as they might be, because they cannot express themselves with any degree of fluency. Frequently, they cannot "hold the ball" when it is passed to them around the conference table. Similarly, their written expression lacks clarity, or is abstract or technical. Poorly written reports may lead to actual misinterpretations. More often, however, their chief weakness lies in the fact that they are not readily understood, and hence do not serve their stated purpose.

Education in economics should furnish a grasp of the very roots of our American enterprise system. How wealth is created, how wages depend on productivity, and how every worker is another worker's customer are the type of basic underlying factors that should be stressed.

The industrial-relations student should follow his college training, or combine it, with some practical work in the field of industrial engineering. He must have some firsthand practical knowledge of the operations on which employees work. If a person has made good in an organization on some practical type of work, he will command much more respect if moved into industrial-relations work than if he did not have such experience. The reason that some people do not grow into industrial-relations work, if they start at the bottom, is that they lack the thirst for research and study about personnel work while they are on some other kind of job in the organization.

Incidentally, the experience which young men have had in the Army is an excellent background for industrial-relations work. Their experience has given them practice in dealing with all kinds of men. Their eccentricities have probably been rubbed smooth by army life. They have undoubtedly come closer to becoming a "common denominator" in the many variables found in human beings.

Above all, education in industrial relations must emphasize that industrial relations is a service function. Viewed in that light, there is no need to draw a line of demarcation between "labor education" in colleges and "industrial-relations education." The terms should be synonymous. Both the student who becomes identified with union relations, and the student who joins management's ranks, perform a service for the same group of people—the workers. Industrial-relations education should teach that management and labor have a large area of common interests.

Hence, when management looks at education in industrial relations, it hopes to see as a product men and women who are imbued with the idea of rendering service; men and women trained to approach problems from the angle of seeking agreement, rather than disagreement; men and women who like people, and, in turn, inspire confidence—most important of all, men and women who are more concerned about *what is right* than *who is right*.

Glenn Gardiner is Vice-President of the Forstmann Woolen Company, Passaic, New Jersey.

EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES AND PROJECTS IN
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

CATHOLIC-SPONSORED LABOR-
MANAGEMENT EDUCATION

Leo Cyril Brown

Catholic interest in labor education dates back at least to 1911 when courses of study for workmen were inaugurated at St. Francis Xavier College, New York City. Until 1940, however, comparatively few Catholic institutions followed the example of Xavier. Since that date a remarkable development has taken place. Today there are no fewer than ninety-eight education programs for workmen conducted under Catholic auspices. Twenty-four labor schools are associated with Catholic colleges or universities; sixty-four schools are sponsored by parishes or diocesan institutions. In addition, there are five forums, which are conducted much in the manner of labor schools, and five labor institutes.

Among the educational programs best known to the writer there is considerable similarity. His experience, however, has been limited largely to schools associated with educational institutions. In these, the majority of the programs are offered at night, generally only twice a week and for terms which rarely exceed thirteen weeks.

A wide variety of courses of varying value is offered by these schools. A 1945 survey of courses offered by seventeen labor institutes attached to Catholic colleges or universities reveals the extent of the curricula.

<i>Course Titles</i>	<i>Number of Schools Offering Course</i>
Administrative Agencies	1
Advanced Speaking and Debate	8
Collective Bargaining	13
Contract Making	4
Co-operatives and Credit Unions	1
Current Labor Problems	8
Economics	9

English Composition	9
Government	3
Grievance Procedure	4
Job Analysis	1
Labor History	10
Labor Law	14
Logic	3
Parliamentary Law	12
Psychology	7
Public Relations	1
Public Speaking	14
Social Ethics	17
Wage Determination	1

What might be considered a typical program offers courses on Tuesday and Thursday nights for thirteen weeks. Classes are held for three forty-five minute periods beginning at 7:30 P.M. The following courses are offered: the Philosophy of Labor; Labor Law; Parliamentary Practice; Wages, Prices, Profits; Public Speaking; Contract Negotiations; Social Ethics; Grievance Procedure; Round Table on Current Labor Problems.

Most of the schools charge a nominal registration fee that varies from \$1.00 to \$5.00, and entitles the student to select any of the courses offered. It is possible to dispense with tuition charges only because the faculty members of the institutions to which the schools are attached and the labor and professional people who teach in them all contribute their teaching services. It should be observed that it would hardly be possible to maintain these schools without the assistance of the latter groups. The quality of the instruction provided by the labor and professional people has been found to be in no way inferior to that of the professional teachers. In fact, their contact with the daily realities of industrial life lends to their instruction a realism and concreteness that makes their contribution especially valuable.

Student body

Some schools admit only members of labor unions; the majority welcome anyone who the director feels could profit by attendance.

None of the schools with which the writer is acquainted limits its enrollment to Catholics.

Many of the schools strive to attract representatives of management. This practice has been found to benefit not only management representatives, but workmen as well. For some years this writer limited attendance at the school which he directed to members of unions. Three years ago he decided to invite representatives of management. Some of the workers at first feared that admission of employers would lessen the value of the school to them; others feared that the employers among the students might in some way or other indoctrinate both teachers and workmen. Experience has shown, however, that workmen, and especially newly appointed union officials, benefit considerably from being able to hear management present its point of view. During the first few weeks, the school took on the character of a debating club and oftentimes the participants debated not issues so much as personalities. Gradually, however, some degree of mutuality was established. The workmen became conscious that management had problems just as real and pressing as theirs. Management officials, on the other hand, were impressed by the earnestness and sincerity with which their fellow students grappled with the problems of industrial relations. At the end of the term both parties testified to the wisdom of the bipartisan approach by urging that similar courses be given in the future.

From the fact that the labor-education programs under Catholic auspices reached only 7,500 students last year, it should not be inferred that its influence is negligible. One should not discount the fact that the great majority of the workmen enrolled were union officials. If every year 7,500 union and management officials in this country could be trained through courses such as this writer has indicated, one could reasonably hope for a pronounced improvement in the nation's industrial life.

Rev. Leo C. Brown, S.J., is Professor of Economics at St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

MANAGEMENT TRAINING PROGRAMS AND AGENCIES

Joseph H. Vertrees

The most powerful threat to our complex, highly interrelated, and delicately balanced economy lies neither in too much or too little legislation nor in the greed of management or labor. It lies in the desire of each group to protect and to fortify itself against that which it does not understand about the other. If effort is a measure of interest, then we must conclude that each group has been somewhat complaisant in its ignorance of the environment and the problems of the other.

We find in our industrial organization, the foundation of our economic well-being, two worlds divided by misunderstanding and conflict. Management lives in a world of markets, organization procedures, and cost sheets. The worker lives in a world of boss-ordered tasks, production standards, group mores—under the pressure of the family budget, provision for the “rainy day,” and the urge to maintain or improve his economic and social status. These two worlds occasionally merge, but under the stresses of today’s economic and social problems the differences are dominant. Workers, ignorant of the facts about our economic system, particularly the problems of organization, finance, and distribution, are an easy prey to panaceas constructed out of misinformation. Management drives to its objectives in ignorance of the sources of workers’ resistance and protective devices. This is a form of illiteracy more dangerous today than that which, in the past, prompted compulsory education in the three R’s.

There is today, however, evidence of a growing determination on the part of management, as well as labor, to try education as a means of developing a workable understanding of management-labor problems. It is turning increasingly to training programs and experiments adapted to all levels, from top executives to workers

in the ranks, to improve management's understanding of the workers' problems and to increase the workers' knowledge of economic laws and company problems.

Practically every large company and thousands employing only a few hundred workers train their supervisors in the interpretation and the application of company personnel policies and the union contract. In many cases these programs include a study of human behavior, economics, and other subjects bearing on worker-management relations. Programs reaching the upper levels of plant management are growing in number, and the idea that general management is not immune to improvement occasionally gleams.

Programs for employees in the ranks, designed to familiarize them with basic economic laws and the problems of management, are among the newest types of training engaged in by industry. While in many situations company-sponsored programs of this sort may be highly successful and of considerable value, it is doubtful if their adoption will be widespread except where the union is a partner in the project. Joint union-management programs have been successfully operated in a number of cases for specific purposes. However, wide use of such arrangements depends primarily on mutual confidence and friendly relations at the local level. The variety of approaches of management to training and education for better industrial relations is indicated by the following brief descriptions of a few proven and experimental programs for supervision.

Training for supervisors

In the Forstmann Woolen Company of Passaic, New Jersey, a labor-relations manual for supervisors, entitled *Your Questions Answered*, has been developed over a period of years out of questions asked by foremen, overseers, and top management relating to problems arising in the application of the union contract. When

questions arise for which the manual does not have a satisfactory answer, they are discussed at regular meetings of top supervisors and foremen. The answers arrived at are submitted to management and approved after discussion with the union. When approved, they are placed in the loose-leaf manual. The unusual features of this plan lie in the speed with which policies are adapted to changing conditions and transmitted to all of supervision.

The home plant of Johnson and Johnson at New Brunswick, in addition to a varied program of formal training for the contact and higher levels of supervision, also conducts, over a period of six weeks, a well-organized, on-the-job training program for prospective supervisors. The training covers all aspects of the foreman's job including personnel problems and policies, leadership techniques, and the training of employees. The prospective supervisor spends two hours daily in training conferences and during the remainder of the time is under direct supervision of a foreman who assigns to him specific supervisory jobs under close observation. For example, the prospective supervisor may be made directly responsible for housekeeping for two weeks or may be assigned to work with the quality-control supervisor or in inventory control for a period of time. The significant feature of this program is the complete planning of the on-the-job training experience and observation.

The Standard Oil Company of New Jersey recently inaugurated a new type of employee-training program, establishing as headquarters "The Esso Training Center" in downtown Elizabeth, New Jersey, near two of their large refineries and their principal product development center. The training center is equipped with modern classrooms, lecture rooms, conference facilities, and a wide variety of audio-visual aids.

The program plan includes leadership training for potential supervisors, a basic supervision course, supervision principles, and advanced training activities. Inspection of the courses in basic super-

vision and principles reveals that more than half of the material involves human relations. The advanced training activities program is designed to provide information for top management and high-level supervisors concerning progress in the training of supervision. It will also include discussions on personnel administration, organization, and instruction in conference leadership.

It is planned to offer the facilities of this center to all units of the company, wherever located, for the purpose of transmitting back to plant training organizations the programs and techniques developed in the Esso Training Center.

Training in the higher levels of management

For training in the higher levels of management there is a great need and little precedent. General management and the directorate normally secure their training in industrial relations from union contacts or from reports of their subordinates. A few companies, however, are operating or planning organized training at the plant or general management level, and others are assigning individual executives to intensive university programs.

General Foods Corporation furnishes an interesting example of a well-defined company program for general managers, of whom there are about fifty in the corporation. The program, conducted in New York City, consists of four one-week training periods during which the executives spend six hours a day in conference classes. The course is divided into two parts: executive leadership and specialized functions. Specific subjects involving industrial relations include personnel work, public relations, and discussion of departmental problems, most of which involve human relations. A shortened form of the training, including weekly sessions from 4:00 to 6:00 P.M. and after-dinner sessions, was given to the president, the vice-presidents, and several members of the board of directors of the corporation.

Programs for employees

The practice of reporting production and financial facts to employees through simplified versions of the company's financial statements and articles in employee magazines has been generally accepted as sound and useful in creating a better understanding of economic facts and laws on the part of employees. Induction programs have also included much valuable company information. Recently, however, a few companies have gone a step further in organizing a program of instruction for employees designed to enlighten them on the policies and problems of the organization in which they work.

The Bell Telephone Company of Pennsylvania conducts such a program for employees, in groups of approximately ten, requiring from five to six hours in a one-day session, on company time. The course is divided into: (1) preliminary discussion of basic economic laws and their operation; and (2) the application of these laws. The application is made by having each group set up and "operate" a telephone company of its own. The situation is visualized by the use of a model village, telephone poles, wires, etc. In developing this hypothetical organization, the employees are introduced to the fundamental economic principles involved in financing and operating a telephone company.

At the home plant of Johnson and Johnson, the management and its employees' union (The Textile Workers' Union of America, C.I.O.) have agreed to experiment with two eight-session courses for employees which include discussions of profit and production, job security, product information, the labor-relations philosophy of the company, the basic principles underlying money-management, the free enterprise system, objectives and goals of industry, factors that determine the cost of product, etc. This experiment, perhaps the first of its kind engaged in jointly by management and labor, will be watched with a great deal of interest by both industrial management and progressive labor leadership.

Joint labor-management programs

The Botany Mills of Passaic, New Jersey, recently launched a joint program for supervisors and shop stewards for the purpose of discussing such problems as procedures under the labor contract, other policies of the company, and problems in labor relations involving absenteeism, labor turnover, etc. The program will consist of fifteen one-hour sessions.

Many joint union-management programs have been set up for the purpose of discussing specific problems or contract negotiations. Rutgers University conducted several joint courses during the war, in such subjects as job evaluation, time study, and human relations. It is believed that the time is ripe for the development of many continuous joint programs of management and labor at all levels, designed to develop understanding and tolerance.¹

Management association programs

A description of management-sponsored training programs would be incomplete without reference to such organizations as the American Management Association, the National Industrial Conference Board, the Society for the Advancement of Management, and the American Society of Mechanical Engineers, through which information and ideas on industrial relations are continuously exchanged. In the four associations named, industrial relations is a major topic of conferences, publications, and research. In practically every large community there is an association of industrial-relations executives meeting periodically to discuss problems in their field. Some of these organizations, particularly the one in Philadelphia, have engaged in extensive research. Brief descriptions of two nation-wide management associations will be sufficient to indicate the nature and extent of their work.

¹ Among many other important training programs, the following may be noted: International Harvester Company, Chicago; General Electric Company, Schenectady; McCormick and Company, Baltimore; Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Company, Minneapolis; Swift and Company, Chicago.

The American Management Association, in existence about twenty-five years, includes in its membership more than ten thousand companies and individual executives in virtually all types of business and industry. It is primarily engaged in assisting in the practical solution of current management problems and the development of the science of management in personnel and industrial relations, production, marketing, and other management functions.

The Society for the Advancement of Management, an organization growing out of a merger of the Taylor Society and the Society of Industrial Engineers, devotes a large portion of its energies to industrial-relations subjects. Chapters of S.A.M. are organized in most of our larger cities. The membership consists chiefly of executives, junior executives, and others in the field of industrial engineering.

The chips are down!

These are but a few typical examples of efforts being made by American industry to encourage a better understanding of the principles and problems of business including, in most cases, strong emphasis on leadership and the problems of workers. If such efforts as these, together with the efforts of organized labor and our educational institutions, succeed in erasing economic and group-relations illiteracy from our industrial world, there is hope for the future. If they fail, neither our present government nor a new one can save us from the penalties.

Joseph H. Vertrees is Chairman of the Department of Management at University College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

AGENCIES AND PROGRAMS IN WORKERS' EDUCATION

Eleanor G. Coit and John D. Connors

Labor education in the United States is conducted by many different types of organizations and groups—labor organizations at all levels, independent workers' education organizations, government bodies, and community groups of various types. Workers' education, which is organized to give those workers who participate a background for effective activity, has always been functional in character, and although it has changed and developed as the labor movement has grown in size and responsibility, the teaching has been developed around specific problems in the lives of the worker-students.

No attempt is made here to describe the total program of workers' education in the United States. Selected national and local agencies will illustrate the wider program.

National Agencies

The American Labor Education Service

The American Labor Education Service is a national agency which has performed specialized functions as well as general advisory services during the twenty-one years of its existence. The work, which last year reached forty-seven states, includes responsibilities carried for a number of years—an information service for educational directors and others concerned in workers' education; advisory and counseling services available to unions and educational chairmen; field services; regional and local conferences on workers' education; the publication of outlines, bibliographies, and other material for local study projects; leadership training institutes; resident and week-end schools; workshops on union and community co-operation; a registry for teachers of workers' classes, and clearing-

house activities. In addition, special projects are organized in local communities to meet specialized needs, studies are conducted,¹ educational programs which relate to strengthening the position of minority groups are developed, and special emphasis is given to the training of group leaders, and to those phases of its work which strengthen union-community co-operation. A.L.E.S. works with both the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations unions, and includes in its membership many teachers and community workers concerned in workers' education.

Workers Education Bureau of America

The Workers Education Bureau of America, since its founding in 1921, has served as a national clearinghouse of information and guidance in the development of workers' education in the United States. In addition, it is now the official agency through which the American Federation of Labor carries on an educational program for its 7,500,000 members.

One of its principal activities has been the establishment of labor institutes of three or four days' duration in thirty-seven states, usually sponsored by state federations of labor and state universities. It also conducts conferences and forums on a more local basis and of shorter duration. Its major emphasis, however, is upon advising educational departments and committees of labor organizations in matters pertaining to the education of their members, in such subjects as: trade-union history, theory, and policies; economics; collective bargaining techniques; parliamentary law; public speaking. In servicing these labor organizations, the bureau is called upon to do research in various subjects, to plan lecture courses, radio courses, radio programs, etc. Recently the bureau has worked with local labor groups on the introduction of courses on labor in the public schools. It also co-operates with public libraries and other community agencies.

¹ See recent publication *Labor Education in Universities* by Caroline War (New York: American Labor Education Service).

Another of the bureau's important functions is the publication of books, pamphlets, bibliographies, manuals, and outlines for workers' education groups. In addition it publishes a monthly newsletter and midmonthly series of articles of current interest to labor.

Education and Research Department, C.I.O.

The Education and Research Department of the C.I.O. is organized to service C.I.O. international unions all over the country. It publishes pamphlets, posters, film discussion guides, and course outlines. A regular bulletin, "Economic Outlook," and a bibliography of free materials are issued each month. Regional educational conferences of C.I.O. people are conducted. A small film library supplies film strips to unions and other groups, and general advisory services are given to community leaders as well as trade-unionists carrying on educational activities.

The Labor Education Service Branch of the Division of Labor Standards, United States Department of Labor

The branch is organized "to promote amicable industrial relations through encouragement of voluntary programs of labor education directed both toward the training of capable union leaders and a membership well informed in the rights and responsibilities of unionism." Among its specific activities are: assistance in the development of workers' education programs; provision of technical consultants and conference leaders; preparation of teaching aids; and development of information and research services to educational and union agencies.

International Unions

United Automobile, Aircraft, Agricultural Implement Workers of America, C.I.O.

The place of education in the program of one of the largest C.I.O. unions, the U.A.W., is indicated by a recent conference of its edu-

cational department; about 750 delegates assembled to discuss methods of carrying on their work at home and to receive background material and inspiration for their program. Sessions were planned under the following headings: Stewards' Training, Co-operatives, Union Administration and Leadership Techniques, Time Study, Political Action, Union Counseling, Union Social Security, and Collective Bargaining. Workshops were set up to consider the use of the following techniques: pictures, charts, and posters; movies; libraries; surveys and opinions; journalism and public relations; radio; recruiting; and recreation. The educational department has a field staff working in all parts of the country. The department issues material of various kinds, including a monthly paper under the title "Ammunition."

Textile Workers Union of America

A second C.I.O. international union whose educational department has done an outstanding piece of work is the Textile Workers Union of America. The program has been developed through the training of indigenous leadership and the use of field workers in selected centers. Summer schools and short courses are conducted, notably in co-operation with the School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin, the Southern School for Workers, and the Hudson Shore Labor School. The work also includes local training institutes in communities where the Textile Workers Union is active: field-work activities, notably in the South, to set up recreation programs and committee activities, and to conduct officer and steward training programs; educational counseling services to locals; the publication of pamphlets and leaflets. Among the courses taught are those in: collective bargaining; labor history; labor economics; making one's own union work; public speaking and parliamentary law; and co-operation with public agencies in the extension of workers' education.

Other union programs

Many other internationals of the C.I.O. conduct important programs, sometimes through their own educational departments, as, for example, the United Packinghouse Workers of America, the National Maritime Union of America, the Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America; sometimes through the direct training of shop stewards or other responsible officers (as notably in the case of the United Steelworkers of America), and sometimes through summer-school programs.

American Federation of Labor unions

Outstanding among the A. F. of L. unions carrying on educational programs is the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. This international union pioneered in setting up local classes for union members and today requires its officers in certain cities to participate in officers' training classes before they assume responsibility of office. The I.L.G.W.U. has prepared pamphlets for use by educational groups, *Training for Union Service*, *Handbook of Trade Union Methods*, *The Eye Route*, *How Lucky Is My Social Security Number?* Summer schools are held in the East and in the Middle West, and encouragement and advice, based on the long experience of this union in carrying on its own program, are given by the national educational office to all types of persons interested in labor education.

Another A. F. of L. union carrying on an active educational program is the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks. For eighteen years its general organizers, business agents, and international union officers have attended annual training courses in trade-union leadership, covering such subjects as: union history, policies, and administration; collective bargaining; labor legislation; and social security. Recently the brotherhood has expanded this program, which sets up for them classes of two weeks' duration in all of the large railroad centers.

The two A. F. of L. unions in the paper industry, as well as the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen and many other A. F. of L. unions, carry on extensive educational programs of their own and in co-operation with some of the universities and other independent agencies mentioned in this article. Of importance is the work of certain national departments of the A. F. of L., such as the Union Label Trades Department and the Division of Social Insurance Activities, whose efforts in behalf of specific legislation serve as an important stimulus to education on the part of local groups all over the country.

In outlining the educational programs of all unions, both A. F. of L. and C.I.O., it should be kept in mind that educational committees of local unions and of city and state bodies all over the country carry on valuable educational programs, through their day-to-day committee work, negotiation procedures, study of economic issues, passage of legislation, and work for community welfare.

State Bodies

Michigan C.I.O. Council

Of growing importance is the work of certain state bodies, and outstanding among these are the Michigan State C.I.O. and the Federation of Labor of Kentucky. The summer school conducted by the Michigan C.I.O. has made a unique contribution through its practical training programs, and many local activities have been carried on co-operatively with the U.A.W. and other unions in the state.

As a project of one of the summer-school groups in 1945, a pamphlet entitled *Stewards' and Committeemen's Manual* was issued, which has had nation-wide use.

Education and Research Division of the Kentucky Federation of Labor

Growing out of a local workers' education council, organized some years ago with the co-operation of the Workers' Education

Committee of Louisville and the American Labor Education Service, a new Education and Research Department of the Kentucky State Federation of Labor was organized. A weekly radio program and a summer school were conducted last year at Eastern State Teachers College in Richmond, Kentucky. Courses included collective bargaining, labor legislation, parliamentary law, public speaking, labor economics, and world events.

Independent Workers' Summer Schools

For twenty-five years, the workers' summer schools, which were pioneers in the field of workers' education, have made possible resident study by men and women workers, and have served as laboratories in the testing of teaching methods.

The Hudson Shore Labor School is located at West Park, New York. Its activities include a resident school and local institutes held for specific unions or to meet special needs. A recent conference of college students and trade-unionists illustrates the long history of this workers' school in bringing college students into contact with worker-students.

The Southern School for Workers is another of the groups making an outstanding contribution through long and successful work in the South. Help is given to unions in organizing committee work, preparing contract clauses, and helping the membership work on legislative issues; classes in elementary education and reading and writing have been set up for many groups; short schools are conducted for officers and for the rank and file; and conferences and institutes are held throughout the year.

Highlander Folk School, at Monteagle, Tennessee, also with long experience in the field, differs from the Southern School for Workers in that it has a resident center. During the summer and certain winter months, institutes and short residence projects are held at the school. In addition, field workers give educational services to trade-unions throughout the section. Among the courses

taught are those in: steward training, labor legislation, political action, labor history and economics, parliamentary law, public speaking, union history, and public relations.

A school similar to those discussed above, but organized for white-collar workers rather than industrial workers, is the Summer School for Office Workers. Its activities include a resident summer session, educational advisory services to local white-collar groups, and local white-collar institutes. The resident school, to which the students come from all parts of the country, has been held for some years in the Middle West.

Local Workers' Education Programs

This short review of workers' education activities in the United States does not allow space for a full picture of local education activities. Labor colleges have been carried on in local communities for a great many years and today there are some new projects which hold special interest. Outstanding among these are the Labor Education Association of Philadelphia and the Madison Workers' Education Bureau. The L.E.A. in Philadelphia is conducted by a local executive council whose members are persons with varied trade-union and community experience. Courses cover a wide range of topics, among which are: industrial unionism; labor in the community; union health and welfare program; job evaluation.

Other programs are state-wide, rather than limited to services within one city. A new state program in Georgia, known as the Georgia Workers Education Service, has been set up within recent months. This program is operated by an independent board made up of trade-unionists from that region. The Georgia People's School has just opened under its auspices. The California Labor School in San Francisco is an outstanding example of a comprehensive curriculum including cultural as well as technical subjects. Labor schools with a political orientation are organized

in several cities throughout the country as, for example, the Rand School in New York City and the Abraham Lincoln School in Chicago.

Other local projects are carried on under university auspices, notably the workers' education program of Rhode Island State College, the extensive activities of the Workers' Educational Service of the University of Michigan, and the new classes and services offered by the Labor Education Division of Roosevelt College. The School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin (now nearly a quarter of a century old), a pioneer school under university auspices, held thirteen institutes in the summer of 1946. Most of these were carried on in co-operation with specific unions, but general institutes were also held, attended by members of various unions. Supplementing the summer program, local classes are conducted throughout the winter in various parts of the state of Wisconsin.²

² For further discussion of labor-education activities under university auspices, see article by James Healy and John Dunlop.

Eleanor G. Coit is Director of the American Labor Education Service, New York City.
John D. Connors is Director of the Workers Education Bureau of America, New York City.

